Coercive Engineered Migration: Zionism's War on Europe

Is Victor Orban the 'Chavez of Europe? (Part 1 of an 11 part series)

by Gearóid Ó Colmáin / January 16th, 2016

> If aggression against another foreign country means that it strains its social structure, that it ruins its finances, that is has to give up its territory for sheltering refugees, what is the difference between that kind of aggression and the other type, the more classical type, when someone declares war, or something of that sort.
> — Sawer Sen, India's Ambassador to the UN

In an EU press conference on September 3rd, 2015 Hungarian Prime Minister Victor Orban candidly referred to the current refugee crisis in Europe as "Germany's problem". Orban was referring to the fact that refugees amassing at the border of Hungary were heading, for the most part, to Germany. The Hungarian Prime Minister stressed that most of the refugees did not intend to stay in Hungary. Orban has come under criticism for his decision to erect a security fence on the Hungarian/Serbian border in order to stem the flow of migrants entering Hungarian territory illegally.

While most of the European media have portrayed Orban as a

xenophobic, far right dictator, the decision to erect a fence was carried out in compliance with EU regulations, which require that all immigrants entering the Shengen zone be registered by the police at the border. Yet, paradoxically, Brussels is criticizing the Hungarian Prime Minister for attempting to comply with EU laws!

France's daily *Le Monde* refers to the Hungarian Prime Minister as the man who is attempting to 'criminalise' illegal immigrants. It is indeed a strange country that would criminalize those who break its laws!

So why is Orban coming under fire? Since coming to power in 2010 Victor Orban has implemented domestic, social and political policies that run counter to those dictated by the EU commission. In 2013 Hungary closed down the office of the International Monetary Fund, bringing the country's finance under state control.

The International Monetary Fund is a key institution of US/Zionist global governance and there are few countries who have escaped its clutches of permanent debt. Therefore, the decision of the Hungarian government to show the IMF the door was nothing short than an act of bold insubordination to US imperialism.

Hungary has also come under criticism for media laws which ban foreign interference from US propaganda outlets such as *Voice of America*, which the Hungarian government deems to be contrary to the public interest. Consequently, the European Union, which is perfectly happy to ban Iranian television stations, has criticized Hungary for violations of 'freedom of speech'.

Orban told an audience in Chatham House in 2013 that he believed there was a "leftist and green conspiracy" in Europe against "traditional values". Orban is no doubt referring to the constant tirades made by war mongering 'leftist' zionists such as EU MP Daniel Cohen Bendit against Hungary. Bendit has ironically called Orban the "Chavez of Europe". This

example of ideological name-calling epitomises the meaninglessness of the left/right political paradigm in the post-Soviet era.

Orban's 'nationalism' is not an imperial project. It is, rather, a national philosophy which goes against, and weakens, imperialism. It is nationalism in the sense of national liberation from neo-colonial oppression in the form of international financial institutions and the EU.

Orban's defense of 'traditional values' has brought him ideologically closer to the foreign policy agenda of Russian President Vladimir Putin, who visited the country in 2014. During Putin's visit to Hungary, Orban praised the Russian leader's role in attempting to find a peaceful solution to the Syrian war. In 2014 Orban told Hungarian media that the Ukrainian war was caused by the desire of the United States to gain control of Eastern Europe. He also pointed out that the United States wanted to draw Hungary into the crisis.

The Hungarian Prime Minister has made no secret of his desire to pursue an independent domestic and foreign policy. Hungary also has close ties to China and Iran. Therefore, to attempt, as some analysts have done, to portray Victor Orban as part of the reactionary, imperialist, xenophobic right is to oversimplify the complex interplay of ideological and geopolitical forces in the current global political arena and, in particular, the deep forces determining the generation and management of the refugee/migrant crisis. Therefore, to compare Orban's opposition to immigration to that of British Prime Minister David Cameron is to oversimplify the matter.

British Prime Minister David Cameron plays up his opposition to immigration. But this has nothing to do with the real agenda of the British government. Cameron's anti-immigration policies are simply the appeal to xenophobia which the Tories require to maintain their electoral votes. Cameron's regime serves international finance capitalism in its most brutal form and finance capitalism needs constant immigration.

Orban's objections are based more on his conflict with finance capitalism and his criticisms of the liberal ideology driving globalisation.

Victor Orban has proposed that the refugees/migrants be sent back to Turkey until the end of the war in Syria. This is a sensible proposal. The 'Refugees are Welcome' slogan and the subsequent marches in favour of immigration served US/Israeli geostrategic objectives. Currently, few people seem to realise that and, as in the Arab Spring of 2011, the bandwagon of US imperialism has no shortage of passengers.

In this sense, Victor Orban of Hungary is, in a very limited way, worthy of the epithet 'Hugo Chavez of Europe'. While many of Victor Orban's political policies are far from left-wing, (for example, the banning of communist symbols) his embrace of a traditionalist, dirigiste form of capitalism with strong pro-family social policies and a multi-vectored foreign policy brings his country closer to countries such as Venezuela, Belarus, Eritrea and other nation-states attempting to maintain their sovereignty in the face of imperialism.

A deeply biased and hostile article on *Le Monde* nevertheless accurately describes Orban's politics as 'economically left wing while culturally right wing'. However, qualification is needed here. His policies are 'left-wing' from the point of view of global corporate finance but Orban's economic policies favour the national, patriotic bourgeoisie and are therefore right-wing from the perspective of the working class.

Hungary's multi-vectored foreign policy has had benefits for the country and especially for other Southern Hemisphere partner countries such as Venezuela. For example, a photo-voltaic energy technology product developed in Hungary and financed by China, was exported to Venezuela in 2013. It is believed that the new Hungarian technology could not only enable Venezuela to become self-sufficient in electricity, it could turn the country into a major exporter of electricity. Venezuela's cooperation with Hungary is vital to the country's industrialisation.

What all the countries mentioned above have in common is an attempt to construct a national voluntarism in order to stem the tide of 'globalisation' and all its concomitant social and economic ills. This involves a national, patriotic bourgeoisie in alliance with the working class against the 'internationalist' compradore bourgeoisie and the 'New World Order'. It is, in many respects, a reversal of the class dynamics of the Second World War when the Soviet Union led an organised international working class in alliance with the remnants of the democratic bourgeoisie against international fascism.

Hungarian Prime Minister Victor Orban came to power in a country that had been ravaged by the IMF and a deeply corrupt 'socialist' party that had emerged from decades of welfare state capitalism under Janos Kadar. Kadar, a liberal, replaced the communist Rakossi during the counter-revolution in Eastern Europe in the 1950s, when capitalism with 'socialist ' characteristics replaced Cominform socialism. The process was euphemistically referred to as 'de-Stalinisation' but was, in fact, an attempt to restore capitalist modes of production.

Hungary's ideological crisis culminated in the attempted coup of 1956, when the CIA, operating out of Vienna, attempted to overthrow the embattled regime with the help of former Nazi collaborators. The 1956 'Hungarian Revolution' was, in many respects, an intelligence prototype for many US orchestrated regime change operations to follow decades later.

Although, Orban is said to have 'fought against communism' as a student, he was, like many others of his generation, a fighter against a particular type of capitalism which he perceived as a "leftist conspiracy" against the people. Marxist Leninists have always considered the triumph of Khrushchevite revisionism in the USSR in 1956 and the subsequent 'de-stalinisation' of the USSR and of the Popular Democracies of Eastern Europe to have constituted a counter-revolution against the dictatorship

of the proletariat.

Khrushchev's reforms involved abandoning state-centralised planning, the re-introduction of profit as the regulator of production, combined with a cynical and anti-Marxist foreign policy of 'peaceful co-existence' between capitalism and socialism. In order to justify these policies Khrushchev wrote a long mendacious speech slandering Stalin. Every claim against Stalin in Khrushchev's speech has since been proven to have been a lie. Soviet revisionism killed not only socialism in the USSR but, with the notable exception of Albania, the hope of socialism throughout the world. This destruction of Marxism Leninism by the Soviet and later Chinese revisionists led to a revival of Trotskyism in Western imperial countries. And it is this 'New Left' that constitutes the vanguard of contemporary Western imperialism.

In this sense, Orban is correct in his analysis of a "leftist" conspiracy against civilization, for what we see today is the triumph of Trotskyist ideology in the form of Zionism and neo-conservativism, where proletarian internationalism has been subsumed by the 'human rights' international on the one hand and 'islamist jihad' on the other, a new 'revolutionary' alliance waging war against the working class.

One only has to observe the clenched fist of the US colour revolutions and the constant appeal to youthful rebellion to understand how capitalism is now deepening its grip on humanity through the appropriation of leftist, revolutionary symbology. Indeed, contemporary US capitalism is, to employ a phrase of Trotsky's, 'permanent revolution'. Or, in the words of US Grand Strategist General Thomas Barnett, "US-style globalisation is pure socio-economic revolution."

But it is a revolution which wages war on the working class. One of the results of the 'Arab Spring' in Egypt was the abrogation of labour laws requiring companies to pay workers during periods of factory closure due to lack of product demand. Many of the strikes that resulted in the

overthrow of Mubarak's regime were led by US funded 'independent' labour organisations.

Given Orban's intransigence on the refugee issue, he is likely to face a US/Israeli backed 'popular protest movement' in an attempt to effect regime change. Colour revolutions often involve the transportation of thousands of foreigners to the place of protest by US intelligence agencies operating through NGOS. This happened in Belarus in 2010. Many of the youths attempting to get into Hungary could be used as a battering ram to destablize the Hungarian nation-state.

Since the fomentation of the 'Arab Spring' by the CIA and its numerous NGOS in 2011, NATO's total destruction of Libya and its proxy war against Syria, millions of people have been turned into refugees. That is why they are fleeing to Europe. But it is not the principal reason for the 'current crisis', or rather the current phase of an ongoing and deepening crisis.

NATO's invasion and destruction of Libya in 2011 has led to millions of desperate people attempting to cross the Mediterranean sea. This ongoing crisis has received varying levels of coverage from the mass media. For example, the sinking of a boat in the Mediterranean in July 2015 only received a four line report in the French *Le Figaro* newspaper, in spite of the fact that a hundred people were drowned!

However, since the publication of a drowned boy washed up on the shores of Turkey in 2015,the refugee crisis has entered a new phase, with the photo of the boy in question being used as an excuse to drum up public support for NATO air-strikes against Syria in order to "stop the massacres"

While no one seems to know just how many Syrians are among the migrants fleeing to Europe, there has been a media fixation on these particular migrants, in spite of the fact that they only represent a minority of the current migrants amassing at the Hungarian border.

The debate about what should be done to manage the refugee/migrant crisis turns on whether or not they should be welcomed into European countries. However, this pro or anti migrant debate masks a new and highly destructive phase in US/NATO geopolitical strategy. Many of the migrants at the Hungarian border are coming from refugee camps in Turkey. Austrian intelligence has reportedly revealed that US government agencies are funding the transfer of these refugees to Europe in an attempt to destabilize the continent. This new geostrategic initiative involves using desperate refugees as weapons for the purposes of US/Zionist divide and rule of the European continent.

France's *Radio Internationale* has revealed that over 95 percent of migrants in the current flow into Europe are young males between 20 and 35 years old. Many are said to be fleeing conscription in the Syrian army, which has lost thousands of brave men and women since the start of the Zionist war on their country. The preponderance of young, fit males among the so-called 'refugees' has also been confirmed to this author personally by researchers of Russian state television RT. When asked about the refugee issue on France's BMTV, Russian Ambassador to France Alexandre Orlov said "All I can see are young men fleeing the war instead of defending their country". So, why are there so few vulnerable women and children among the refugees escaping the war in Syria?

The journey across the Mediterranean to Europe can normally cost up to 11,000 dollars, more money than most European workers manage to save from years of hard labour, yet we are told that millions of war-ravaged Iraqis and Syrians are suddenly able to pay this colossal sum to make the journey to Europe. How is this possible?

The glorification of the young men fleeing conscription in Syria, coupled with the demonisation of the heroic men and women in Syria fighting for their country's freedom, is deeply indicative of the moral turpitude of our own ruling class for whom disloyalty and cowardice are the principal

characteristics.

In September a Hungarian camera woman was filmed tripping a refugee carrying a child at the Hungarian border. The video soon went viral. The camera woman is now taking legal action against the man she tripped as he has changed his story to the police. Petra Laszlo has claimed that she panicked as refugees began to charge towards her. There was much indignation in the politically correct corporate media. But Syrian patriots did some research on the Laszlo's 'victim'. The man's name is apparently Osama Abdel-Muhsen Alghadab and he is a member of Japhat Al-Nosra, the Al-Qaida affiliated terrorist group that has massacred thousands of innocents in Syria.

This is not to suggest by any means that all of the refugees attempting to enter Hungary are terrorists. But in the context of a global war involving complex international networks of terrorists operating under the aegis of American, Israeli and European intelligence agencies, this incident is another argument in favour of Orban's policy of implementing normal immigration regulatory procedures.

In February 2011 Libyan leader Muammar Gaddafi warned Europe about the danger of an invasion by migrants and, in particular, Al- Qaeda terrorists if he were to be overthrown. Syria's President Assad has also warned Europe of the danger of thousands of Al-Qaeda and Islamic State terrorists coming to Europe, disguised as refugees. It is quite possible that a similar scenario is now coming to pass.

Gearóid Ó Colmáin is a journalist and political analyst based in Paris. His work focuses on globalization, geopolitics and class struggle. He is a regular contributor to Dissident Voice, Global Research, Russia Today International, Press TV, Sputnik Radio France, Sputnik English, Al Etijah TV, Sahar TV, and has also appeared on Al Jazeera and Al Mayadeen. He writes in English, Gaelic, and French. Read other articles by Gearóid, or visit Gearóid's website.

This article was posted on Saturday, January 16th, 2016 at 10:07pm and is filed under Capitalism, China, CIA, Egypt, Espionage/"Intelligence", EU, France, Germany, Hungary, IMF, Israel/Palestine, Libya, Media, Mercenaries, Militarism, NATO, Neoliberalism, NGOs, Propaganda, Refugees, Russia, Socialism, Syria, Terrorism (state and retail), Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, Zionism.

The Weaponisation of the Refugee

Coercive Engineered Migration: Zionism's War on Europe (Part 2 of an 11 Part Series)

by Gearóid Ó Colmáin / January 20th, 2016

Artificial mass migration as imperial policy has a long history. To illustrate this, we will cite a few historical examples. According to Bulgarian historian A, Eminov, civil wars in the Balkans in the 13th and 14th centuries led to significant population decline, which greatly facilitated colonisation of the Balkans by the Ottoman Empire. The deportation of nomads and organised transportation of Muslim refugees by the Ottoman Empire played a significant role in the colonisation of this region.

Though Turks comprise over 8 percent of the Bulgarian population today, Turkey's neo-Ottomanism has sparked accusations from Bulgaria's nationalist party Attack that Turkey has plans to re-colonise the country. Bulgaria has the highest number of mosques in Europe per capita.

Given the fact that Turkey is supporting the Islamic State in Syria, while harbouring neo-colonial plans for the Balkans, the decision by the Bulgarian government to erect a fence along the border with Turkey is the right one. Opposition politicians in Bulgaria have described the subservience of their government to the EU and NATO as treachery and tantamount to genocide against ethnic Bulgarians, whose population has

been declining drastically since the fall of communism.

In the 19th century the British Empire organised the mass migration of Bengali Muslims to Burma to work plantations in the predominantly Buddhist Rakhine State. The purpose of the migration was to create an artificial ruling class that would depend on the protection of the British Empire. The result was more than a century of tension with the indigenous Buddhist inhabitants and the Muslim settlers, a tension that has led to the ethnic cleansing of today, whereby Takfiri fanatics, financed by Pakistan and Saudi Arabia are committing genocide against local Buddhist peasants with the full complicity of 'human rights' organizations and the mass media as part of a US/Israeli geostrategic initiative to kossovise the Rakhine State by separating it from Myanmar, thereby securing a foothold for Western neo-colonial interests in the highly strategic Bay of Bengal. The so-called 'Rohingya crisis' attests to a new phase in imperialist policy; namely, the ruthless weaponization of the refugee.

In the nineteenth century, Imperial Belgium imported hundreds of thousands of Rwandan Tutsi workers to the Congo to staff their work colonies. This artificial migration policy of Belgian imperialism has played a major role in the context fueling the current ethnic cleansing and ongoing neo-colonial proxy wars being carried out by the US/Israeli and European powers in the Democratic Republic of Congo, where the US /Israeli Tutsi puppet regime of Paul Kagame is murdering and pillaging on behalf of Western corporations. The *Wall Street Journal* has ironically described Kagame's Zionist puppet regime 'The Israel of Africa'.

Here Hutu refugees fleeing Kagame's genocidal regime have been systematically bombed and slaughtered by the Zionist backed Rwandan military. Refugees fleeing war have been used by the aggressors as a pretext to wage further war and conquest. The US and EU have been

destabilizing Burundi since April 2015. Now, terrorists are attacking the country from refugee camps in Rwanda, with full backing by Western powers.

A population explosion in London in the 16th and 17th centuries provided much of the impetus behind the colonisation of America. Over two-thirds of the first settlers in North America were indentured servants, 75 percent of whom were young men under the age of 25. The youth were needed to expand the labour capacity of the Empire's colonies. The settler culture, imbued with religious fanaticism and a complex of superiority, did not take long to decimate the native American population. One of the reasons for the population decline of the Powatan native peoples was their tolerance and kindness towards the settler culture.

Comparing the mass migration of people from the Global South to Europe today to the European colonisation of the United States might appear strained and inappropriate but there are important similarities, nonetheless. Like the 16th and 17th centuries, the world is experiencing a recrudescence of religious war, while population explosions and war in the developing world are driving mass migration. This time, however, as the world has already been divided through centuries of European colonisation, people of the Global South are now moving North. The potential for conflict between a declining native population and an assertive, Muslim-dominated settler culture is great, particularly when this serves the interests of Europe's ruling elite who are in cahoots with the Wahhabi sheiks of the Middle East. Whilst the people of the Global South are fleeing the consequences of European imperialism, the indoctrination of Wahhabi Islam among Muslim immigrants constitutes a serious impediment to an awakening of class consciousness necessary for the unification with non-Muslim natives against their internationalist bourgeois oppressors.

In seventeenth century Ireland the British government settled lands in

the northern province of Ulster with Protestant and Presbyterian settlers who lived in fear of the Catholic neighbours they had displaced. It was an imperial policy of divide and rule which lasted for centuries. In the nineteenth century, famine and mass emigration from Ireland to America were caused by the British state's refusal to allow Irish peasants the right to eat the fruit of their labour. The mass migrations benefited the emerging ruling class of the United States who required cheap labour as well as the British government who wanted to reduce the population of Ireland. In other words, mass migration enabled the trans-Atlantic Anglo Saxon financial elite to turn the very social and economic problems they had created to their own advantage. The loss for Ireland was irreparable. Western Europe's oldest literary vernacular language was reduced to minority status, while the loss in youthful resourcefulness worked in favour of the status quo, ensuring Ireland's subjugation to the British imperial elite, both before and after formal independence.

A more recent example of migration used as a tool of imperialism is Eritrea. Since the country's independence from Ethiopia in 1993, Eritrea has chartered a unique independent path to national liberation and socio-economic development. The results have been astounding, with economic growth rates surpassing most other developing countries. However, the socially-oriented policies of the Eritrean government have brought it into conflict with neo-colonial interests. As a consequence, sanctions were imposed by the United States in 2009 on the only country in the Horn of Africa that has never failed to feed, clothe and educate its children.

Meanwhile, millions flee hunger and poverty in the US client state of Ethiopia, which is currently occupying part of Eritrea since the US backed Ethiopian invasion of that country in 1998. US geostrategy against Eritrea involves smuggling Eritreans into Europe in a vast, logistical operation involving officials in the United Nations and 'human rights' NGOs such as Watch the Met.

This neo-colonial outfit is heavily involved in the smuggling of Middle Eastern and Central Asian refugees from Turkey.

Watch the Med is a cogent example of how petty bourgeois European prejudice against developing nations is harnessed by elites to further their globalisation agenda. The NGO, which claims to oppose the EU 'militarization' of the Mediterranean and fortress Europe' slammed Colonel Gaddafi's Libya for its alleged 'abuse of migrants' rights', in spite of the fact that Gaddafi's Libya was praised by the UN for its respect for human rights and was integrating thousands of sub-Saharen migrants in the Libyan Jamahirya, where they were able to work and benefit from free health care, education and accommodation.

A key figure in this criminal operation is a Nobel Prize candidate who goes by the name of "Father" Mussie Zerai, a phony Catholic priest who has been coordinating the smuggling of East Africans to Europe from war-torn Libya, earning him lots of cash, kudos and the epithet 'Archangel of Refugees'. Zerai collaborates closely with Watch the Med.

It is impossible to tell if Watch the Med is receiving funding from captains of globalisation such as George Soros, but these European do-gooders would certainly deserve decent salaries from the Jewish oligarch.

As part of the destabilisation of Eritrea, the EU is giving preferential treatment to refugees if they register as Eritreans. Eritrean researchers have shown that most of the migrants from East Africa are from Ethiopia and Somalia. Yet, they register upon arrival in the EU as Eritreans. The migrants are often lost at sea. Al Jazeera recently did an interview with a trafficker from Ethiopia who confirmed that thousands of citizens from that country are being smuggled into Europe. Yet Eurostat figures for 2013-14 show no Ethniopian citizens whatsoever while Eritreans are astonishingly high.

In a *Market Watch* article entitled "Here's my plan to solve the asylum

chaos", George Soros slams Victor Orbans' policies stating that they threaten to 'divide and destroy the EU'. Soros strongly advocates the creation of 'NGOs' to facilitate the mass migration into Europe.

Orban has pointed out that those welcoming the refugees/migrants into Europe are playing into the hands of Soros and global financial oligarchs.

The Eritrean government has proof of the CIA's role in smuggling desperate people from the Horn of Africa. They also have proof of Amnesty International's attempt to foment political unrest and violence in the country.

The phony 'Eritrean' refugee crisis is being cynically used by the corporate media to slander Africa's only free and truly democratic, post-colonial nation, hampering its development while filling the coffers of the heinous 'human rights' murder machine, all in the service of empire. This again attests to the weaponization of the refugee. The current escalation of the refugee crisis in Europe should be analyzed in this context.

So what is the purpose of weaponizing refugees?

In the book *Weapons of Mass Migration: Forced Displacement, Coercion and Foreign Policy,* Kelly M. Greenhill, US foreign policy consultant, argues that coercive engineered migration is a strategy which has been used by governments to gain concessions from other governments. In other words, governments often use refugees as weapons in order to exert pressure on other governments for political ends. Greenhill documents over 59 examples of refugees being used as weapons since the Second World War.

While there are undoubtedly many women and children and innocent victims of NATO/Zionist fomented war among the flux of people migrating to Europe who deserve all the help they can get, it is deeply

reactionary and dishonest to ignore the obvious instrumentalisation of migration by imperialism. Rational and honest analysis of this complex phenomenon tends to prevail in developing countries such as Russia and Iran, whose press agencies have provided extensive evidence of this problem. However, spurious political correctness often stifles constructive debate in Western countries with some analysts such as this author being slandered on social media as 'fascists' and 'racists' by soi-disant 'leftists' for discussing these facts. George Soros and company would certainly agree with them.

• Read Part One here

Gearóid Ó Colmáin is a journalist and political analyst based in Paris. His work focuses on globalization, geopolitics and class struggle. He is a regular contributor to Dissident Voice, Global Research, Russia Today International, Press TV, Sputnik Radio France, Sputnik English, Al Etijah TV, Sahar TV, and has also appeared on Al Jazeera and Al Mayadeen. He writes in English, Gaelic, and French. Read other articles by Gearóid, or visit Gearóid's website.

This article was posted on Wednesday, January 20th, 2016 at 1:42am and is filed under Belgium, Bulgaria, Burundi, Democratic Rep. Congo, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Imperialism, Ireland, Libya, Media, Myanmar/Burma, NATO, NGOs, Propaganda, Refugees, Turkey, Zionism.

Barnett's Five Flows of Globalisation

Coercive Engineered Migration: Zionism's War on Europe (Part 3 of an 11 Part Series)

by Gearóid Ó Colmáin / January 21st, 2016

As German independent TV station K-TV has revealed, the current refugee crisis is most likely the brain child of the afore-mentioned US military grand strategist General Thomas PM Barnett. Barnett was a strategic advisor to former US Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld and currently works with the Israeli military consultancy firm Wikistrat. Wikistrat are close collaborators with US Africa Command (Africom). Barnett's books *The Pentagon's New Map* and *Blueprint for Action* have had a major influence on US/Israeli global military geostrategies.

A former student of Vice-Admiral Andrew K. Cebrowski, former director of the Office of Transformations in the US Department of Defense, Barnett's work focuses on integrating Cebrowski's concepts of Network Centred Warfare, Colonel Boyd's OODA loop theory, and Lind's Fourth Generation Warfare, by 'simultaneously seeking to relate their yin-and-yang interplay to the larger economic reality of globalization's emergence as the dominant characteristic of today's strategic environment'.[I]

Barnett divides the world into 'functioning core', 'non-integrating gap'

countries and 'seam states'. The first category of 'functioning core' countries includes Europe and North America, Russia, China, Japan, South Korea, India, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Argentina, Brazil and Chile. These are economies which are actively integrating into the global economy. This category is subdivided into 'old core' Europe, the USA and Japan and 'new core', Brazil, Russia, China and India.

The second major category is the 'non-integrated gap'. This is made up of the Caribbean Rim, Andean South America, Africa, parts of the Balkans, the Caucasus, Central Asia, Southeast Asia and the Middle East. The third category contains some members of the first two. This category is referred to as the 'Seam States', countries which surround the Gap — such as Indonesia, Thailand, Pakistan, Turkey, Greece, Algeria, Morocco, South Africa, Mexico and Brazil.

The former Pentagon general has developed the theory of the 'Five Flows of Globalisation' — five flows which must come about if US Zionist imperialism is to dominate the world. These involve the free flow of money, security, food, energy and people. The 'free flows' theory means breaking down nation-state structures, thus freeing up resources for pillage by US multinational corporations. The inundation of Europe with immigrants from the Southern Hemisphere is a key feature of Barnett's geo-strategic thinking. That is why it would be wrong to see the immigrant crisis from Libya and Syria as an unintended consequence of NATO policy as some form of unforeseen blowback.

Europe's top demographers have known for some time that the Southern Hemisphere countries are experiencing a population boom and what that means for Europe's relative population decline. German sociologist and demographer Gunnar Heihsohn published a major book on this topic, *Söhne und Weltmacht: Terror im Aufstieg und Fall der Nationen* (*Sons and World Power: The Rise of Terror and the Fall of Nations*). In his book Heinsohn argues that population youth bulges were the driving factor

behind European colonialism and world conquest. From 1900 to 2000 the population of the Muslim World has grown from 150 million to 1,200 million, an increase of 800 percent. He argues that large families tend to produce 'superfluous' sons, who, unable to find work at home, emigrate.

Heinsohn contends that these youth bulges can lead to extreme violence as the young men, needing to carve out a place for themselves in the world, often tend to resort to violence in order to survive. This is one of the many factors driving the Islamic State. The youth bulge means boom time for imperialism's merchants of death, who are harnessing youthful anger and hatred for the fomentation of proxy wars against geopolitical enemies. Heinsohn predicted that Europe would be overwhelmed with Southern Hemisphere youths by 2015.

The German sociologist notes that Islamism is more a tool which enables disaffected 'superfluous' sons to justify genocide, rather than an ideology which they necessarily believe in. In other words, once demographic balances have been restored, the Korans will be for sale in second-hand book shops. He gives the example of Spanish and Portuguese conquistadores in the 15th and 16th century who, needing to kill in order to carve out colonies in the New World, made convenient use of the Bible in order to absolve themselves from feelings of guilt.

Heinsohn notes that Europe's immigration policy contrasts markedly with that of Canada, Australia and New Zealand. In Europe, there are no requirements that immigrants possess the qualifications needed by European economies, whereas in Canada and Australia those with the highest skills are given preference. The result of these policies is that 98 percent of immigrants in Canada have higher qualifications than the native population, whereas in Europe only 10 percent have higher qualifications. At the same time, the percentage of highly qualified Europeans leaving the continent for the Anglophone world is rising steadily every year. In this sense one can understand the logic behind

Anglo-Saxon imperialism of flooding Europe with uneducated immigrants, while simultaneously siphoning off the continent's brains and skills, thus ensuring Anglo-American/Zionist global hegemony. It is the ability to take into account these complex demographic realities which constitutes the importance of Thomas P.M. Barnett's grand strategy of US globalisation.

In her book *Weapons of Mass Migration: Forced Displacement, Coercion and Foreign Policy* Kelly M. Greenhill argues that one of the reasons for Europe's rapprochement with Libyan leader Muammar Gaddafi was the latter's offer to stem the tide of African emigration to Europe. It would be erroneous, therefore, to suggest that the chaos wrought by the Arab Spring was unintentional. While many European politicians may have wanted to prevent a chaotic overflow of immigration into Europe, the imperial agencies behind the Arab Spring wanted just that.

The mass exodus of migrants/refugees is a central part of the globalisation of class war in accordance with the Pentagon's long term objectives of global hegemony or "Full Spectrum Dominance". What we are dealing with here is a well-planned strategy of chaos. To paraphrase Shakespeare, it is madness but there is method in it.

General Barnett's Wikistrat are heavily involved in the development of 'crowd sourcing' and 'crowd leveraging' technologies. Investigative journalist Andrey Fomine, using the analyses of the Russian Academy of Sciences, has convincingly shown that most of the twitter entries encouraging refugees/migrants in Turkey to travel to Germany come from the UK, USA and Australia.

What we are witnessing here is a covert war being waged by the Anglo-Saxon Zionist elite against the German Federal Republic. The low-intensity war is using people as weapons to create conditions of social chaos in order to prevent Berlin's inevitable rapprochement with Moscow. The migrants cannot possibly integrate in German society if the German

economy does inot integrate with Eurasia, as Germany will have no viable market for its exports.

Barnett has predicted that Muslim immigrants in Europe will form their own Islamist political parties. In his book *Blueprint for Action* he quotes approvingly from Oliver Roy's *Globalized Islam*, who claims that while in the past working class Muslims would have joined Marxist political movements: "There are now in the West only two movements of radical protest that claim to be 'internationalist': the antiglobalization movement and radical Islam. For a rebel, to convert is to find a cause"

Both of these movements, that of 'human rights' and 'jihad', represent petty bourgeois objections to the global order, but as they do not have a scientific analysis of the capitalist mode of production, they cannot possibly change that order. That is why they are both backed by the forces they supposedly oppose. Hence Barnett welcomes this development:

> By channeling their sense of economic and social disconnecteness into political action, Muslims in Europe achieve connectivitiy with governments there that allow for their integration into political life on a peaceful basis while preserving a sense of cultural identity. (p. 292)

In other words, these movements will help increase and further entrench globalization, imperialism and class warfare.

> In Europe's case, this isn't just the political release valve for both sides but an economic one as well: Europe needs workers to balance its rapidly aging population, while the Middle East needs to be able to siphon off a portion of its huge youth bulge for emigration. (p. 292)

Barnett predicts that the mass migration of people from the Middle East into Europe will lead to a 'revival of ethnicity'. He argues that their immigration into Europe will generate a paradoxical attitude that will

marry Muslim identity politics at home with European human rights evangelism in their countries of origin. He writes:

> So when Muslims emigrate from the Middle East and immigrate into Europe, both regions respond to this transaction by becoming, respectively, more Islamic and more European in the near term, until such time passes that new rule sets emerge to define these profound forms of social(family ties), economic(remittances), and ultimately political connectivity. While the movement of Core citizens into the Gap occasionally force Core powers to defend them through military means.... a far more potent form of political connectivity comes in expatriate populations living inside the Core and agitating for their adopted nations to intervene militarily or diplomatically in their countries of origin in response to instability or political repression there. A good example of this, of course, is the role of Iraqi expatriates in the US decision to lead a multinational coalition into that country in 2003 to topple Saddam Hussein's regime. (p. 294)

This is imperialist grand strategy accounting for demographics, economics, religion and ethnicity. But its core function is similar to the imperialist ideologies of the past: divide and conquer the workers of the world on the basis of religious and ethnic sectarianism, as well as bourgeois values such as human rights, thereby making the world "safe for capitalism" and global imperialist domination.

A recent example of expats mobilising for imperialist intervention in their own country was provided by demonstrations by Eritreans in Germany against President Issias Afwerki in 2012, with the predictable US NGO inspired slogan "Down, down dictator".

Barnett predicts that Europe and Russia will disintegrate in the 21st Century, leaving only India and China to rival the United States. The US strategist clearly believes that coercive engineered mass migration into Europe, coupled with American occupation of Eastern Europe and the

Balkans, will prevent Eurasian integration, whilst securing the US/Israeli control of Europe and the conquest of Africa, thereby establishing US/Israeli global supremacy in the 21st century.

The choreography and mediatisation of the 'Refugees Welcome' campaign bears a striking resemblance to 'Je Suis Charlie' campaign launched less than 30 minutes after the first reports of the Paris terrorist attack in January 7th were broadcast.

Many of the migrants are receiving welcome booklets packed with maps and information distributed by an NGO called w2eu,which stands for welcome to the EU.

One is reminded of the non-violent revolution rule book by Zionist ideologue Gene Sharp which was used to train activists in the US/Israeli fomented counter-revolutions in North Africa in 2011.

- Read Part One here; Part Two here;

1. Barnett, Thomas PM, 2005,*Blueprint for Action*: A future worth creating, p.7, New York, Berkley Publishing Group [↩️]

Gearóid Ó Colmáin is a journalist and political analyst based in Paris. His work focuses on globalization, geopolitics and class struggle. He is a regular contributor to Dissident Voice, Global Research, Russia Today International, Press TV, Sputnik Radio France, Sputnik English, Al Etijah TV, Sahar TV, and has also appeared on Al Jazeera and Al Mayadeen. He writes in English, Gaelic, and French. Read other articles by Gearóid, or visit Gearóid's website.

This article was posted on Thursday, January 21st, 2016 at 12:10am and is filed under Australia, Canada, Europe, France, Germany, Imperialism, Iraq, Libya, Refugees.

Rothschild's "Slaughter Ships"

Coercive Engineered Migration: Zionism's War on Europe (Part 4 of an 11 Part Series)

by Gearóid Ó Colmáin / January 24th, 2016

Austrian intelligence officials have reportedly revealed that US government agencies are paying for the transport of migrants to Europe. On August 5th, 2015 Austrian magazine *Infodirekt* reported:

> It has come to our knowledge that US organisations are paying for the boats taking thousands of refugees to Europe. US organisations have created a co-financing scheme which provides for a considerable portion of the transportation costs. Not every refugee from North Africa has 11,000 Euro cash. Nobody is asking, where is the money coming from?

French government officials have also been caught selling life boats to refugees in Turkey. France's France 2 Television station filmed French honorary pro-consul Françoise Olcay in Turkey in *flagrante delicto*.

When the official was asked if she was aware that her actions were illegal, she indicated that there were hundreds of Turkish officials involved.

Many of the refugees/migrants arriving in Europe are being provided with false Syrian passports. Until the violence in Syria in 2011, Syrian

passports were printed by French government printers. This fact strongly suggests French government involvement in the distribution of false Syrian passports.

European governments are out-sourcing the management of the migrant crisis to private companies.

The aforementioned K-TV has also revealed that private multi-national project management companies such as ORS Services have been making millions of Euros from the plight of refugees. In 2014 ORS Services received 21 million Euros from the German government and has seen profits doubling since the refugee crisis. The Austrian newspaper *Heute* reported that ORS made 21 million euro this year alone from the migrant crisis.

Shareholder finance of ORS Services is managed by the private equity firm Equistone Partners Europe, an affiliate of the Rothschild-owned Barclays Bank, which is considered to be the most influential financial institutions in the world. German economist Wolfang Freisleben has described Barclays Bank as "Rothschilds slaughtership". Barclays is the most important shareholder in both NM Rothschild bank and Lazard Brothers. Former director of Barclays Marcus Agius is married to a daughter of Edmond de Rothschild. Agius was also director of the British Broadcasting Corporation's executive board and served in the Steering Committee of the secretive Bilderberg Group.

As in the case of the Arab Spring, some anarchists are once again unwitting tools and fools of imperialist subversion. The Berliner anarchist collective "Peng"! is helping to smuggle immigrants into Europe illegally. This is part of the groups 'international solidarity'. The organisation is funded by the ultra-right wing Ayn Rand Institute, whose director is Israeli and Zionist ideologue Yaron Brook.

Ayn Rand was a Jewish philosopher who promoted the concept of

objectivism; the idea that self-interest is the goal in every individual's life and that *laissez-faire* capitalism is the only system compatible with the individual's super-egotism.

Here again we see capitalism's reliance on youthful rebellion of a politically correct 'leftist' variety in order to further entrench its grip on humanity.

A key 'weapon' used in 2011 by imperialism to destroy the institutions of the nation-state was the smartphone. Thousands of smartphones were provided to US-funded 'activists' during Zionism's 'Arab Spring'. It is unsurprising, therefore, to see that smartphones are being supplied to thousands of migrants by NGOs once they arrive in Europe. This could become a nightmare for any nation-state refusing to cooperate with imperialism's migration agenda.

Researchers in Germany found that migrants were being supplied with smartphones by Austria's A-1 mobile phone company. The A-1 mobile company is controlled by Mexican Billionaire Carlos Slim. Slim, whose real name is Salem, comes from the Levant.

That is why Hungary is at the heart of the current crisis. Refugees of NATO's imperialist wars are now being used as geopolitical tools with which to destabilise the recalcitrant Hungarian state as a stepping stone to a long, low-intensity civil war in Europe. By erecting a fence to protect Hungary's sovereignty, Orban is defying the objectives of the Empire. And while there are undoubtedly many desperate people waiting at the Hungarian border, the fence, by stalling NATO's destabilisation plans, is also helping the millions of refugees in Syria under the protection of the Syrian Arab Army and indirectly, through its robust defense of national sovereignty, Hungary is joining the resistance of countries such as Belarus, Venezuela and Eritrea from the empire of chaos.

Yet, similar to the consensus surrounding the 'spontaneous' and 'popular uprising' during the Arab Spring, there is an almost entire 'leftist' consensus that Victor Orban is a cruel and racist tyrant. Concrete and complex analysis has ceded ground to a chorus of platitudinous pronouncements about the "rights of asylum seekers" and the

"obligations" of European countries to receive them. Just as in the Arab Spring, it is believed that the refugees/migrants are coming to Europe as an unintended consequence of NATO's policy in Libya and Syria, rather than being part of a much wider and more complex geostrategic initiative to use people as weapons in order to break down all resistance to US/Zionist globalisation. Here again, to echo the words of General Barnett, it is capitalism which is proving to be the avant-garde of global revolution, rather than its so-called 'socialist' and 'leftist' critics.

Billionaire George Soros has advised the European Union to increase funding to NGOs and the private sector dealing with the refugee crisis. It looks like Brussels is following his advice with the fund put aside to deal with the crisis now doubling to 9.5 billion euro. Good news for Equistone Partners Europe, the Rothschild banking mafia!

Another organisation highly active in the smuggling of refugees to Europe is 'Fluchlinghelfer.In', which is funded by the afore-mentioned Ayn Rand Institute.

Meanwhile a state founded on the creation of refugees is deeply concerned about the plight of Syrian victims of Zionism's wars.

Jewish 'humanitarian' agencies such as the Multi-faith alliance for Syrian Refugees and the Jewish Coalition for Syrian Refugees in Jordan, who have no interest in the plight of millions of Palestinian refugees of Zionism, are actively offering Syrians in Jordanian camps 'resettlement' in Europe and America. What Syrians manipulated by Israeli agencies fail to realise is that these same agencies are responsible not only for the destruction of their country but they could soon be joined in Jordan by Palestinians deported by Israel.

Meanwhile, IsraAid, the Zionist entity's international 'aid' agency, is active in the Balkans helping migrants get to central Europe.

An article published in the *Suddeutsche Zeitung* on October 14th 2014, states that Syrian refugees in Turkey are going hungry due to lack of

funds for their upkeep. It states that 280 million euros more are required to feed the refugees. In other words, pocket change.

While other reports in the German media indicate that the German state will have to dish out 46 billion dollars per annum to finance immigration.

The insanity of Chancellor Angela Merkel's immigration policy has been denounced by US presidential candidate Donal Trump. In a recent interview, he says:

> It's insane… letting in that many people. What they should do is all get together, including the gulf states, who have nothing but money. They should all get together and have a safe zone in Syria where they could live and then ultimately go back to their country, go back to where they came from…. I've been watching this migration and I see the people. They're men, they're mostly men. And they're strong men. These are physically young, strong men. They look like prime-time soldiers. Now, it's probably not true but where are the women? You see some women. You see some children. But for the most part, I'm looking at strong men. So, you ask two things. Number one: why aren't they fighting for their country? And another thing. I don't want these people coming over here.

Of course, one can be under no illusions about the reactionary, chauvinist policy of Donald Trump who is playing on xenophobia to get elected, nor will Trump ever admit that the US is responsible for the entire humanitarian catastrophe in Syria, Iraq, Libya and many other countries. His question as to why the young men are not fighting for their country is ironic given the fact that the fighters he supports are fighting for the US and Israel. However, like so many sources of information, Trump's comments about the preponderance of young, fit men are highly significant.

After the January 7th, 2015 Charlie Hebdo terrorist attacks in Paris, Chancellor Angela Merkel appeared in Berlin at a vigil for the victims of the attack. At Merkel's side were Turkish-German politicians who are members of the ruling party. They are also members of the Turkish islamo-fascist organisation 'The Grey Wolves'. This organisation has now over 20,000 members in Germany and many of their members have joined the Islamic State in Syria, posting videos of their atrocities on line.

That means that there are members of the German government with close links to the Islamic State.

German collaboration with Islamist terrorism goes back a long way. During the Second World War, the Nazis armed Muslim SS divisions in Albania and Bosnia who committed atrocities against Jews and Orthodox Christians in the Balkans. During the Yugoslav wars of the 1990s, Germany's secret service, BND (Bundesnachrichtendienst) armed and trained Bosnian Islamist terrorists as part of NATO's 'Drang nach Osten'. Now the same German agencies are bringing the wars home.

The German government recently held a conference in Berlin called 'Dialogs and Vision for Germany in 2050'. The conference predicted that many sociological terms used today will be soon be obsolete. One of the terms referred to in the booklet is 'immigration background'. The conference booklet states the reason for the concept's obsolescence is that 'because everyone will be so "mixed" and everyone will have a migration

background.

This means that the notion of belonging to a country, of being able to retrace one's ancestry through the centuries in the country of one's birth, this notion will be obsolete. In other words, no one will have any identity, other than that of a consumer. Commodity fetishism will constitute the identity of the 'Germans' of the future. The document also describes this future as a 'global utopia'; a utopia for the ruling elite, a nightmare for the millions of rootless, acculturated, post-modern nomads. While being cosmopolitan can certainly be an advantage for some, cosmopolitanism as a form of class-driven social engineering is another matter. Cosmopolitanism as social engineering is not only class war, it constitutes a new form of colonialism.

The white-colonial settlement of the United States brought to a brutal end thousands of years of Native American cultures and civilisations. Those natives who survived the White colonial invasion and genocide are today reduced to poverty, social exclusion and misery. What we are witnessing in Europe is a form of reverse colonialism, whereby victims of globalisation in the Southern Hemisphere countries are being artificially transferred to Northern Hemisphere states. Under conditions of capitalism, this can and will only lead to civil war and chaos. In the case of Turkey, there is a overt policy of Wahabisation, not only of Turkey itself but of Europe.

It is most politically incorrect to highlight these aspects of Germany's 'multi-cultural' utopia and, as we have already shown, political correctness constitutes the psychological attitude of that vacillating social class we refer to as the petty bourgeoisie. It is a form of thought-policing predicated on moral injunctions. One must not be anti-Semitic; one must not be racist; one must not be Islamophobic; one must not be homophobic etc., etc. This is what Jean Bricmont has rightly referred to as the "moral left". In Europe, they are best represented by groups such as

'anti-Fa' who perform on the level of social and psychological warfare, that which NATO's puppets effect on the battle field; namely, the stealthy and indefatigable promotion of Zionism as 'anti-racism' and Zionism in the form of 'humanitarian' wars.

In order to more thoroughly understand the significance of the current refugee/migrant crisis, we need to discuss some of the principle geopolitical philosophies that have shaped both British and American imperialism for well over a century.

• Read Part One here; Part Two here; Part Three here;

Gearóid Ó Colmáin is a journalist and political analyst based in Paris. His work focuses on globalization, geopolitics and class struggle. He is a regular contributor to Dissident Voice, Global Research, Russia Today International, Press TV, Sputnik Radio France, Sputnik English, Al Etijah TV, Sahar TV, and has also appeared on Al Jazeera and Al Mayadeen. He writes in English, Gaelic, and French. Read other articles by Gearóid, or visit Gearóid's website.

This article was posted on Sunday, January 24th, 2016 at 9:41am and is filed under Capitalism, Corporate Globalization, France, Germany, Hungary, Imperialism, Israel/Palestine, Jordan, Libya, Media, Militarism, Money supply, NATO, NGOs, Propaganda, Refugees, Syria, Turkey, Zionism.

The Balkanisation of Europe: Neo-Prometheism and Neo-Ottomanism

Coercive Engineered Migration: Zionism's War on Europe (Part 5 of an 11 Part Series)

by Gearóid Ó Colmáin / January 27th, 2016

Prometheism was a political project initiated by Polish dictator Josef Pilsudski in the early 20th century. The project aimed to promote separatist and nationalist movements in the non-Russian peoples of the Russian Empire. The breakup of the Russian Federation is a key strategic ambition of NATO. In this sense, the encirclement and destabilization of Russia could be described as neo-prometheism.

In a talk for the Chicago Council on Global Affairs in February 4th, 2015 entitled 'Europe: Destined for Conflict?', George Friedman of Stratfor argued that US geopolitics in Europe is based on the objective of keeping Russia divided from the European peninsula by creating a US occupied corridor or 'intermarium' (a term coined by Pilsudski) from the Baltic to the Black Sea.

It has been understood by US military planners for over a century that it is in Germany's geopolitical interest to integrate with Russia in the form of an Eurasian Union while it is in America's geopolitical interests to stop

this unification. The goal of US/Israeli foreign policy is to control Eurasia's heartland. In Halford Mackinder's, the father of geopolitical science, famous words:

> Who rules East Europe commands the Heartland; who rules the Heartland commands the World-Island; who rules the World-Island commands the world.

Friedman has said that the 'German Question' is the key issue of our time. That is, no doubt, the reason why Hungarian Prime Minister Victor Orban refers to the refugee/migrant crisis as "Germany's problem". Orban understands that NATO's destruction of Ukraine is likely to spread into Mitteleuropa, and that Germany's geopolitical integration away from the Atlantic powers and towards the Eurasian Union, will be opposed by an engineered demographic and social destabilization.

In Friedman's own words:

> It is not in the American interest to see German, European let's say, European industrialism and technology united with Russian natural resources. This is not what US grand strategy really wants to see happen.

Here Friedman is clearly alluding to Nordstream, a gas pipeline linking Russia to Lubin in Germany inaugurated in 2011 and currently under expansion. The gas pipeline is the longest in the world and has the potential to supply all of Europe. This project is opposed by the United States.

Friedman advocates a similar US foreign policy to that which prevailed during the Iran-Iraq war during the 1980s when the US, having heavily armed both countries, ordered Saddam Hussein to invade the Islamic Republic of Iran. Is the US planning to foment a military confrontation between Europe and Russia?

While Poland, already overburdened with Ukrainian refugees, is reluctant to take in more, the Eastern European state is complying with EU requests to accept more immigration. Friedman has predicted that Poland will, under US patronage, become a major European regional power this century. A strong Polish client power hostile to Russia is vital to securing NATO's sabotage of Eurasian integration. Therefore, US militarisation and US technological transfer could turn Poland into a major European power, keeping Russia in check by preventing its integration with Germany. If the current junta in Kiev is to survive, it will have to rely increasingly on Poland. Poland played a key role in the Ukraine coup of 2014.

The same reliance on Poland will apply to the Baltic States. In order to encourage Russophobia, the United States will flatter Polish chauvinism with references to the renaissance of the Polish Lithuanian Empire of the 16th and 17th centuries. In September 2014, a joint Poland, Lithuanian, Ukrainian military brigade finally became operative.

Meanwhile, US/Israel will continue to use Turkey as a bulwark against Russian ambitions in the Eastern Mediterranean. However, with one of Europe's most powerful militaries, Turkey is also a rising power. While continuing to rely on Turkey in the destruction of Syria, the United States and Israel are also attempting to get control of the Kurdish PYG forces in Syria.

Sputnik's geopolitical analyst Andrew Korybko writes:

> The position of the US is in this conflict is Machiavellian to the max. It supports the Turks as they battle the PKK, but it's also giving aid to the Syrian-based PYG Kurdish militia and the Kurdish Regional Government in Iraq, knowing full well that the training and weapons it provides will likely be funneled to their affiliated PKK partners in fighting Turkey. This circular logic isn't incidental, as it's all part of a larger plan by the US. One the one hand, it wants to see how far along

> Turkey can go in invading Syria, and when/if it hits a wall (be it with the Syrian Arab Army and/or the Kurds), it could then reverse its support for Ankara (ergo the semi-critical talk about a "proportionate response" in attacking the PKK) and try to turn all the Kurdish groups against it in order to begin the formal dismemberment of the Mideast and give birth to the 'geopolitical Israel' of Kurdistan.

While President Barzani of Iraqi Kurdistan has been a loyal servant of the United States and Israel, recent attacks by Israel's Secret Intelligence Service, ISIS, against Erbil may force that leader to seek closer ties to Russia. Israel is now attempting to pull Kurdish fighters in alliance with the Syrian Arab Army into the Islamic State.

The recent 'popular uprisings' of Kurdish separatists in Mahabad, Iran, is most likely the handiwork of US/Israeli regime changers and it could have serious implications for security of Iran, Turkey and Syria.

The long-term objectives of the US/Israel is to establish a Kurdish puppet state of Greater Israel, piping its oil from Mosul to Haifa in Israel.

Erdogan, by waging war on Syria, is playing into Israel's hands, unwittingly sabotaging his country's reemergence as a world power as Turkey risks losing vast territories to a Zionist Kurdistan state.

Meanwhile, the US has for a long time been encouraging Turkish Pan-Turanism to gain a foothold in Central Asia and Western China. It is hoped that Turkey can be used to check Russian and Chinese influence in the Turkic speaking nations of Central Asia. Turkey can also be used to destabilise the North Caucasus by fomenting islamist terrorism while an Iran brought under US control can check Turkey's ambitions in Central Asia. Similarly, India, which is still a US/Israeli client, can be used to keep Iran in check, provided the BRICS integration is sabotaged. However, this may prove difficult to achieve given recent moves by both countries to 'ditch the dollar' in their oil transactions.

The US is also aware of Turkey's key geopolitical relationship with Japan. Both countries are maritime powers being used by the United States to check Russian and Chinese hegemony. The key to US imperialism is to prevent those powers from escaping vassalisation to the United States, by using them to weaken Russia and China, while maintaining US control of that process.

Turkey's loss of Kurdistan could force it to seek further influence in the Turkic speaking Central Asia, while rising Turkish hegemony over the Black and Caspian Seas would bring it into conflict with the US, who 'rule the oceans'.

While Pan-turanism is currently being encouraged by the US, it could present a strategic threat in the future if Turkey was to become a major maritime power. The encouragement by Washington to Turkey's rise as a maritme power will not be without complications.

The Greek Turkologist Dmitry Kitsikis's geopolitical theory of the Intermediate Region which sees North Africa, the Middle East and parts of Eastern Europe as forming a civilisational zone unique in world culture and history, has had a major influence on current Turkish and Greek geopolitical thought. Kitsikis's conception of a Hellenic-Turk confederation in a new Ottoman Empire could eventually run counter to US interests.

The US intends to use Poland as its terrestrial power base in Eastern Europe to prevent Russian expansion. If both Poland and Turkey can be used to destroy Russia, then US foreign policy interests will involve getting Poland and Turkey to destroy themselves in a future war, where the US would back both sides. That is why Friedman has predicted that Poland and Turkey will be at war with each other this century, as Eastern European demography and geography begin to resemble the landscape of the 17th century. In contrast to Germany and other European nations, Poland's borders are operating normally. There have been no illegal mass

migrations into Poland.

Currently, NATO's war in Ukraine is likely to extend southward towards Turkey, with Moldova, Transnistria, Macedonia and the Balkans being engulfed in ethnic violence. The destablisation of Macedonia has already begun and although a US sponsored colour revolution was defeated there last year, NATO's plans for a 'Greater Albania', have not been abandoned. Islamist terrorists trained by the CIA in Afghanistan played an integral part in the destruction of Yugoslavia during the 1990s and provided the pretext for NATO's 'humanitarian' bombing of Serbia in 1999.

Azerbaijan is also on NATO's list for destabilization. The important oil-rich country has been moving closer to Russia and is facing conflict from both an Armenia moving closer to the United States who are also backing Karabakh independence and colour revolutionary activity inside Azerbaijan. The destabilization of Azerbaijan would have enormous consequences for the security of Russia and Iran. Northern Iran has an ethnic minority of 22 million Azeris. A colour revolution in Azerbaijan could bring ultra-nationalists to power, who are advocating an annexation of 'Southern Azerbaijan'. Meanwhile tensions inside Iran between Kurds and Azeris are running high over the Iranian government's attempts to create a new Kurdistan province that would include part of Iran's Western Azerbaijan province.

Given the incessant media war currently being waged against Azerbaijan, a colour revolution attempt by NATO against that country is not unlikely.

This would mean that the entire region from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea and from the Eastern Mediterranean to the Caspian Sea would be engulfed in internecine warfare. Furthermore, the constant influx of migrants towards Western Europe from these war zones will be managed by Zionist Coercive Engineered Migration with a view to maximizing ethnic and inter-religious tension in Europe, thereby reinforcing the

ideology of the 'war on terror' and the 'clash of civilisations'. Here again, the key to Fourth Generation Warfare is to use the consequences of imperialism to further imperialism. But one should not overlook the fact that Fourth Generation Warfare was invented by Chinese communists fighting Japanese fascism during the Second World War. If we are to have a future as peoples, nations, cultures, ethnicities, races, in short, as human beings, we must retrieve the concepts and vocabulary of human emancipation which have been callously usurped by tyrants to enslave us.

• Read Part One here; Part Two here; Part Three here; Part Four here;

Gearóid Ó Colmáin is a journalist and political analyst based in Paris. His work focuses on globalization, geopolitics and class struggle. He is a regular contributor to Dissident Voice, Global Research, Russia Today International, Press TV, Sputnik Radio France, Sputnik English, Al Etijah TV, Sahar TV, and has also appeared on Al Jazeera and Al Mayadeen. He writes in English, Gaelic, and French. Read other articles by Gearóid, or visit Gearóid's website.

This article was posted on Wednesday, January 27th, 2016 at 4:44pm and is filed under Azerbaijan, China, Eurasia, France, Germany, Hungary, Imperialism, India, Iran, Israel/Palestine, Japan, Media, Militarism, NATO, Neoliberalism, Poland, Propaganda, Refugees, Russia, Syria, Turkey, Ukraine, Zionism.

The "German Question"

Coercive Engineered Migration: Zionism's War on Europe (Part 6 of an 11 Part Series)

by Gearóid Ó Colmáin / January 31st, 2016

Since the unification of German states by Bismark in 1871, the German question has been at the centre of European geopolitics. From the Treaty of Berlin in 1924 — which gave assurances to the USSR of Germany neutrality in the case of imperialist aggression against the Soviet state, to the Nazi-Soviet non-aggression pact of 1939, which sabotaged the Rome, Berlin, Tokyo axis, thereby threatening to ruin Anglo-American plans to use Germany to destroy the USSR — the basis of transatlantic strategy regarding Germany has been to prevent the European central power from becoming too close to Russia.

Since unification, however, Germany's export market and energy requirements have brought it into closer collaboration with Russia. It is in this wider and far more complex geopolitical context, therefore, that one must approach Germany's current demographic transformation.

As we have shown in previous parts, the mass media's pro and anti- migration discourse serves to obfuscate the fact that the refugee/migrant crisis is being manipulated by US/Israeli imperialism in order to achieve US/Israeli geopolitical objectives in Europe. The US government is perfectly aware from reports of the National Security Agency that Germany's integration with Russia is only a matter of time and that the only way to stop this geopolitical reality is to wage a low-intensity war on Germany. Former director of the Central Intelligence Agency Micheal Hayden has predicted that Germany and Central Europe will be engulfed in civil war by 2020.

When the US intelligence community make prognoses, those estimates are often more about what they are attempting to achieve than avoid. Therefore, such reports should not be taken lightly.

Germany's demographic crisis is pushing the government to promote mass immigration but this policy is likely to back-fire given the fact that the Zionist power-elite of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation are using differences of religion and race in order to divide and conquer nations resisting their control. A key aspect of this use of religion is the promotion of the Wahhabi death cult among Muslims by the Zionist client regimes of Saudi Arabia and Qatar.

Statistics of the United Nations reveal that Europe will have to attract 20 million immigrants per annum if it is to solve its demographic crisis. This means that the German bourgeoisie have realized that soon there will not be enough young people to pay for their retirement upon the beaches of the countries their companies impoverished such as Spain and Greece. So, Germany's degenerate ruling elite is hoping that immigrants from NATO's war zones can be a new source of super-exploitation.

This is deeply indicative of a failed social model. German dissident journalist Eva Hermann has blamed bourgeois feminism for this development, a movement promoted by capitalism during the 1960s which encouraged mothers to abandon child care and spend most of their time at work. The result was a major decline in the birth rate of the

German Federal Republic and a massive increase in social fragmentation. This contrasted markedly with the demographic health of the German Democratic Republic, where women's social emancipation was combined with government policies that made it easier and more affordable for women to spend more time with their children.

As we speak, white supremacist hooligans are gathering in Berlin's streets attacking 'Salafist' Muslims and other immigrants, while potentially thousands of Islamic State terrorists are on their way to mainland Europe with the connivance of US and Israeli intelligence. Many of Europe's neo-Nazi movements are pro-Israel and have close links to Tel-Aviv. For example, Jewish militias led by Israeli special forces operatives played a key role in the 2014 coup in Ukraine which brought a neo-Nazi regime to power.

The routine policy of the mass media in Europe is to demonise Muslims by refusing to carry out any investigation into the agencies behind terrorist attacks, while at the same time presenting all critics of mass immigration as 'neo-Nazis'. The reality is that both neo-Nazis and takfiri terrorists serve Zionist interests as both groups blame the victims of imperialism rather than the perpetrators.

However, the German people do have every right to be worried about the take over of their country by the Wahhabi death-cult. An important player in the Wahhabisation of Germany's Muslim youth is Turkey.

The former editor of the *Frankfurter Allgemeine* (and CIA 'unofficial cover') *Udo Ulfkotte* has recently revealed that the Turkish ambassador to Germany made a speech in the German Bundestag in 2009 exhorting Turkish Muslims to rise up against the secular German state. The incident was not reported in the German press. While in Austria, comments by the Turkish ambassador that Austria was claiming that Turks were being treated like a 'virus', were met with a fulminating attack by Austrian politicians on Turkey's 'islamist' policies and persecution of Christians.

The arrogance of the Turkish foreign diplomats *vis a vis* their European counterparts strongly suggests that they have the backing of the United States in not only entering the European Union but, more importantly, in their attempt to spread Wahhabism as a neo-colonial method of social control in a capitalist Europe entering into a new era of neo-feudalism.

In his book *Deutschland: Vorsicht Burgerkrieg– Germany: Beware of Civil War*, Ulfkotte provides strong evidence of the growing terrorism against native German communities by Muslims in suburbs where they have become a majority. The Wahhabit death cult is causing similar problems throughout Europe.

A recent study by the Austrian government revealed that over half of the country's Turkish population wanted Shariah law, while over 25 percent of the country's Muslim youth said they valued Shariah more than the laws of the country. There have been numerous attacks on Christian priests by Salafist gangs throughout Germany, while non-Muslims are already a minority in schools where they are bullied by Muslims. There are already 12 Islamic Courts operating in Britain with full state recognition. Muslim men in Britain who have more than one wife are now entitled to extra benefits from the state; while the Archbishop of Canterbury has claimed that Christian doctrine is 'offensive' to Muslims.

Muslim women in Holland are being provided with separate buses; Muslims in Bremen, Germany, have access to separate blood banks; butchers in Muslim dominated districts are being forced to stop selling pork to their customers; while many suburbs in European cities are now being controlled by Salafist militias imposing Shariah law on the residents. Meanwhile, Salafist preachers are allowed to operate with impunity in European cities, calling for the rape of non-Muslim women, while giving advice to their followers on how to defraud state institutions. These facts and many more are fully documented in Ulfkotte's book.

But there is one major problem with Ulfkotte's presentation of these facts. The author fails to probe deeper into the causes of the Wahhabisation of Muslims and their mass migration to Europe. Instead, there are many instances where he seeks to gain support for Israel. What he fails to point out is that Israel, more than any other nation, is

encouraging the Wahhabisation of Muslim youth and that the Saudi and Qatari regimes pushing Wahhabi barbarism in Europe, through their construction of mosques and their numerous death-cult TV stations, are the sister regimes of the Zionist entity.

Followers of Ulfkotte will no doubt join the far-right Pegida movement. But this will only exacerbate the problem as this movement supports Israel. In other words, this movement is simply the other side of the problem people like Ulfkotte claim to address. The current invasion of Europe is a neocolonial project sponsored by the Ziono-Wahhabi imperial alliance. It is a divide and conquer strategy of the global ruling class. As such, the only way to combat this problem is to educate native Europeans and immigrants about the class nature of these issues, so that they can unite on a class basis against the financial elite who are using religion and race as a tool of class oppression.

Political elites have long understood the historical implications of Marxist theory; namely, that capitalism digs its own grave and creates the conditions for its overcoming. The socialisation and globalisation of labour in the era of information technology will bring capitalism to an end. This has also been predicted by elite political scientists such as Jeremy Rifkin, who in his book *The Zero Marginal Cost Society: the Internet of Things, the Collaborative Commons and the Collapse of Capitalism* predicts that in 60 years time capitalism will no longer exist. This would be a good thing if Rifkin were advocating the socialisation of the means of production. But this is not the case. On the contrary, Rifkin is arguing for a post-capitalist global order ruled by a super-national global financial elite. In short, neofeudalism.

As one writer puts it:

> Rather than a reordering or economic and political life in the direction of a post-capitalist utopia, there is every reason to believe that the outcome of these developments will be a sort of neo-feudalism, as those currently in control of large pools of capital use their position in the global pathways down which goods, information, and power flow to regenerate their structure of social control through globalized structures of debt and resource appropriation.

As we have already pointed out, the German government recently held a conference which discussed the country's future. The conference was called Visions 2050, Future Dialogues "Made In Germany". The conference brochure published online predicts that by 2050, all Germans will have an immigrant background; the traditional family will no longer exist and there will no longer be any pensions for old people. It also predicts that borders and nations will no longer exist as people will see themselves as world citizens. There will no longer be any elections as people will 'participate' in politics through online petitions under the auspices of a world government. The document refers to this future world as a 'Global Utopia'.

It is likely that wahhabisation will be a key strategic element in bringing out a New World Order. If Wahhabi muslims become the majority in Europe, they will subject all to their tyranny. Thus, sufficient conditions of terror would be created to facilitate global governance. Meanwhile, the 'Islamic threat' will deflect people's attention from class struggle, pitching working class ethnicities against each other to the benefit of the oligarchs.

Germany's President Joachim Gauck recently told German reporters that the German nation needs to be newly defined. Gauck stated that the German people are far too linguistically, culturally and racially homogenous and therefore need to be mixed with other races, languages and cultures.

In a conversation with Micheal Frederich Vogt of Querdenken.TV, German Marxist Philosopher Professor Peter Feist argued that Gauck's comments violated the German constitution:

> The people referred to in the German constitution is the German people and not other people. When the German president promotes the abolition of the German people or their dissolution, this is in a classical sense, a betrayal of the constitution.

Professor Michel Frederich Vogt goes further, citing the 1948 UN Convention on the Prevention and the Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. Article 2, section c states that genocide involves '(c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part'

It is most politically incorrect to criticise these aspects of Germany's 'multi-cultural' utopia and, as we have already shown, political correctness constitutes the psychological attitude of that vacillating social class we refer to as the petty bourgeoisie. It is a form of thought-policing predicated on moral injunctions. One must not be anti-Semitic; one must not be racist; one must not be Islamophobic; one must not be homophobic etc, etc. This is what Jean Bricmont has rightly referred to as the "moral left". In Europe, they are best represented by groups such as 'anti-Fa' who perform on the level of social and psychological warfare, that which ISIS effects on the battle field; namely, the stealthy and indefatigable promotion of Zionism as 'anti-racism' and Zionism in the form of 'humanitarian' wars.

Educated in the German Democratic Republic, Peter Feist has noted that East Germans were taught to be proud of their own nation, culture and identity while supporting the national liberation struggles of people in the Southern Hemisphere. This is one of the reasons why German patriotism is stronger in East Germany than in the West. East Germans were brought up on Marxist ideology. This means that social problems were approached from a class analysis. This contrasted with the petty-bourgeois cultural Marxism that prevailed in the West, where the Frankfurt School did much to generate a culture of 'moral leftism' in a state presided over by a gang of former Nazis.

Geert Wilders of Holland and Marine Le Pen of France are politicians whose ostensibly anti-globalization policies are fooling many people. Both are supported by Israel and the Zionist establishment. Both politicians focus on the problem of Muslim immigration. Both ignore the problem of Zionism. The stupidity of the far right can be seen in their own publications about the refugee crisis. For example, the neo-fascist website *Counter Currents Publishing*' recently posted an article praising the aforementioned formation of an 'intermarium' of East European states against 'genocide of white people'. What these writers do not realise, however, is that the intermarium is the very policy of Zionists who want to see Europe embroiled in internecine conflict with Russia, to the detriment of both Europe and Russia and all the neo-fascists beloved white Christian race!

German Chancellor Angela Merkel has been put under enormous pressure from the left-wing 'Linke' party in the Bundestag. Unlike social democratic parties in France, Die Linke has been more consistent in its opposition to Germany's subservience to US imperialism. Dr. Gregor Gysi has called the German government cowards for not taking measures against the US after the NSA espionage on the German chancellor's phone in 2014. Gysi also alluded to the fact that Al Qaida was a creation of the CIA.

However, Gysi also celebrates the physical annihilation of the German race. He has said that it was a good thing the Nazi Germans did not reproduce. This is another example of the absurd self-hatred inculcated in German culture since the nation's defeat in the Second World War, one which is leading the country towards civil war and demicide.

Former Vice-president of the Organisation for Cooperation and Security in Europe, Willi Wimmer, believes that the civil wars caused by NATO in Yugoslavia will spread throughout Europe. Although a member of the conservative CDU party all his life, Willmer has said that only a leader who stands up to US imperialism, such as Venezuela's Hugo Chavez, can save Europe from destruction. It would be naïve to think that a bourgeois leader could save Europe from destruction but bourgeois leaders like Victor Orban who stand up to the IMF and US imperialism in Europe are taking important steps in the right direction with policies that favour national sovereignty against globalisation.

However, one should be cautious in evaluating Orban's politics. Andrew Korybko has argued that Orban is playing a double game, playing up national chauvinism at home disguised as patriotism while secretly promoting NATO interests in the Balkans. This may well be the case.

However, Orban's nationalism will not save Europe in the end. Imperialism is what is destroying Europe. Capitalism is its content and zionism is its form. There are already reports of superexploitation of migrants in Germany with some working for one Euro an hour.

Automobile production and sales constitute the basis of the German economy. Volkswagen is one of the world's most popular and successful cars. In 2006, Volkswagen AG opened a major new manufacturing plant in the city of Kaluga in Russia. Volkwagen is now one of the biggest investors in Russia's automobile manufacturing industry.

Volkswagen are believed to have some of the most innovative technology for the production of diesel fueled engines. For many years America's major automobile companies General Motors and Ford have been struggling to compete with German and Japanese cars. German manufacturers have worked out a formula to produce engines that run on impressively low fuel intake. Cars such as Volkswagen, while more expensive to produce, have a good reputation for quality and durability.

The American regulations on emissions from diesel are far stricter than those in Europe. This is because the United States, unlike Germany, does not have a monopoly in the production of efficient diesel fueled cars and it is attempting to compete with more efficient German and Japanese models.

Volkswagen is one of the industries with most to gain from closer links with Russia and China. The German company has also engaged in negotiations with the Iranian government for massive investment in Iran's automobile industry. It has been predicted that German investment in Iran could turn the country into a major hub for regional automobile production.

Given the fact that the NSA has key information on Germany's elites, and the growing German discontent with US-imposed sanctions on Russia, the recent emissions scandal may be part of the current, covert war being waged by the United States against Germany, an attempt to rein in an economic powerhouse with Eurasian ambitions.

As the US government seeks to gain a competitive industrial and geostrategic advantage over Russia, China and Germany by courting India with a major new General Motors investment scheme, which is touted to turn India into an Asian car producing hub, the current Volskwagen scandal could be part of a US-orchestrated 'yellow flag' attack. In *Blueprint for Action*, General Barnett writes:

> I compare this sort of broadband warfare, or what some Fourth Generation Warfare theorists consider the epitome of that concept, to the notion of the "yellow flag" in a NASCAR race. In that situation, the caution flag, raised as a result of some accident on the track, requires all drivers to maintain their position vis-a-vis one another until the debris is cleared. In this form of 4GW, the purpose of creating anonymous disruption of networks would be to generate a perceived "yellow flag" situation so as to take advantage of the resulting confusion to improve one's position in the "race", either absolutely (leaping places ahead, so to speak) or just relatively(closing the gap with competitors). The purpose of the anonymity would therefore be to alter one's position in any competition without being identified as the cause of events that triggered the change. (p.127)

Pressure from the German industrial sector indubitably played a role in Chancellor Merkel's recent *volte-face* in relation to German policy towards Syria. In contrast to the unwavering belligerence of France, the UK and the United States, Merkel infuriated her allies, by dropping the proviso that "Assad must go" stating that the Syrian president should be part of a transition process.

Moreover, a recent dispute between German Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier and NATO commander General Philip Breedlove, over the latter's "dangerous propaganda" concerning the Russian threat in Ukraine led Reuters news agency to report 'Germany and NATO not on the same page'.

On July 29th, 2014, Deutsche Wirtschafts Nachrichten headlined a report: 'Putin confidante: There will be a war in

Europe' In spite of these warnings, the EU, under US orders, increased sanctions against Russia.

In spite of several requests by the Bundestag to have US nuclear weapons removed from German territory, in September 2015 the United States Air Force moved B61 nuclear bombs to Germany.

This comes at a time when the country is being destabilized with a US/Israeli orchestrated refugee weaponization campaign and a covert economic war.

In the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung on September 23rd, 2015, Johannes Leithauser reported that the security of all Germany's military barracks, air force bases and weapons munitions and depots is to pass into private hands. He writes that:

> The German defense forces are now completely privatizing their own security is not just due to German government reforms, but follows EU directives, which also apply to Germany.[1]

With reports of thousands of Islamic State terrorists heading for Germany disguised as "refugees", it is perhaps unsurprising that the above-cited report did not receive much attention, given the fact that the newspaper in question is run by the CIA.

Leithauser's article notes that security corporations welcomed the German government's decision to implement the new privatization of security policy. Security and the 'project management' super-exploitation of migrants, will clearly be Germany's future 'growth industries'.

While Germany and the European Union are plunged into deeper crisis from a US/Israeli engineered 'refugee crisis', the Chinese economy could be facing catastrophe as European demand for Chinese exports drops dramatically. This coupled with US backed Uighur terrorism account for China's decision to intervene in Syria.

Former German government adviser Christoph Horstel has called the refugee crisis in Germany 'US chaos management'. Horstel maintains that the war which NATO is waging against the people of the Middle East is now being transferred to Europe. The astronomical number of migrants could never hope to arrive in Germany without being secretly helped by the BND, Germany's secret service. The refugee is, therefore, according to Horstel, a new phase of division and conquest of the world by the global finance mafia and their armed gang, NATO.

Director of the European Council on Foreign Relations, Hans Kundani, has written extensively about Germany's geoeconomic imperative to move out of the Atlantic alliance and move closer to the Eurasian Union. The US/Zionist refugee/migrant destabilisation needs to be understood in this context.

Throughout this article we have used the term US/Israel instead of NATO. It is important to explore in the next segment the wider political, cultural and racial implications of this power configuration.

• Read Part One here; Part Two here; Part Three here; Part Four here; Part Five here;

1. Private Wachleute statt Soldaten, Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, p 4, September 23rd, 2015 [↩]

Gearóid Ó Colmáin is a journalist and political analyst based in Paris. His work focuses on globalization, geopolitics and class struggle. He is a regular contributor to Dissident Voice, Global Research, Russia Today International, Press TV, Sputnik Radio France, Sputnik English, Al Etijah TV, Sahar TV, and has also appeared on Al Jazeera and Al Mayadeen. He writes in English, Gaelic, and French. Read other articles by Gearóid, or visit Gearóid's website.

This article was posted on Sunday, January 31st, 2016 at 1:14am and is filed under Austria, Capitalism, CIA, Denmark, EU, Fascism, France, Germany, Hungary, Imperialism, India, Iran, Israel/Palestine, NATO, NSA, Refugees, Russia, Syria, Ukraine, Zionism.

All content © 2007-2019 Dissident Voice and respective authors | | Top

Pseudo-leftist Cognitive Policing on Race

Coercive Engineered Migration: Zionism's War on Europe (Part 7 of an 11 Part Series)

by Gearóid Ó Colmáin / February 5th, 2016

In order to fully comprehend the implications of the US/Israeli strategy of weakening Europe through a divide and rule policy of artificial mass migrations, the questions of race and demography need to be looked at more closely. For Israel is a racist nation-state. It is the world's only nation state based on a strict interpretation of racial identity. Yet it is a state, which, through its myriad lobbies and think tanks across the world, has managed to direct US foreign policy in its interests for many decades, in spite of the fact that the US is a multiracial, multicultural federal state.

It must be noted that political correctness has rendered all rational discussions of race and identity impossible. In Germany, for example, Internet users who publish comments on Facebook, deemed by the authorities to constitute 'anti-foreigner' or racist sentiment, could be liable to prosecution resulting in the confiscation of their children by the state. Post something on Facebook which the German state – a state which supplies Israel with tanks and submarines — deems 'anti-foreigner', and you could see your children being abducted by the agencies of that state.

We have already mentioned in previous parts of this series that General Barnett's Wikstrat is a key strategic partner of Africom, US/African Command. In US geopolitical strategy, preventing Russian/European integration also requires bringing Africa under US/Israeli control. The mass exodus from Africa to Europe is not only intended to destabilise Europe but also to keep Africa in a state of dependency and poverty, pillaging its resources, while draining the continent of many of its brightest citizens through the weaponisation of refugees. This is an age-old imperial policy of dividing and conquering African nations by fomenting religious and ethnic divisions. The United States and Israel intend to use Europe and in particular France for this purpose, while utilising the consequences of European imperialism to keep Europe weak, divided and hopelessly subservient to the Zionist Empire's interests.

In his monumental book on Sudan, *Al Bashir et Darfour la Contre Enquete*, Franco-Camerounian author Charles Onana shows that human rights organisations financed by Jewish Lobbies both in France and the United States are at the forefront of covert wars against the people of Africa, where Christians, Muslims, Animists and other religious communities and ethnicities are being pitched against each other by the Mossad in order to divide and conquer the continent on behalf of corporations closely linked to the Jewish State. In order to deflect attention from Israel's covert wars in Africa, however, 'anti-racist' organisations such as SOS Racisme in France and Antifa — a supposedly 'anti-fascist' outfit — attack genuine peace activists and anti-imperialists with calumny, defamation and sometimes physical intimidation. This has become quite apparent during recent NATO wars against Libya and Syria.'Anti-racism' and 'anti-fascism' have become key words of Zionist war propaganda.

African intellectuals are, for the most part, systematically excluded from French public discourse on Africa. Only African pundits willing to toe the neo-colonialist line can expect to be invited on French TV. A similar

code of exclusion prevails in French universities with the result that students of working class and predominantly émigré universities such as Paris VIII often have to endure lectures by white academics on the positive role of French colonialism in Africa as well as seminars on France's 'human rights' and 'democracy' mission on the 'dark continent.' This author has recorded numerous testimonies of African diaspora students who have deliberately imbibed and regurgitated neo-colonialist discourse in order to get their sociology and political science degrees.

At the same time French university campus walls are lined with posters of fake left-wing, pro-imperialist parties and organisations such as NPA and Front de Gauche, while young black intellectuals are harassed and threatened by Wahhabised Arab youth in increasingly ghettoized suburbs of French and European cities. This Salafist lumpen proletariat is increasingly opposed by white skinhead hooligans in a society descending into dystopian chaos. Resistance to imperialism has never been more difficult than in this era of total counter-revolution.

Meanwhile, the Zionist ruling class are promoting an an aggressive racial integration agenda throughout Western Europe. Television and radio discussions extolling the importance of 'metissage', or miscegenation abound. Former French president Nicolas Sarkozy, who is of Jewish ancestry, has said miscegenation is a matter of life and death for the survival of the French nation.

Sarkozy is married to the aristocrat Carla Bruni, whose father was Jewish. Bruni has said she is "crazy about Israel".

Sarkozy has close links to Rabbi David Zaoui of the Chabad Lubavitch Jewish movement, who believe all non-Jews are sub-human.

The founder of the Chabad Lubavitch movement Rabbi Schneerson is on record stating that the mass murder of Arab women and children is justified.

Rabbi Zaoui has praised Sarkozy for his advocacy of the deeply controversial Noahide Laws, which we will discuss in the next parts of this series.

The obsession of Europe's Jewish elite with their Jewishness and their adherence and devotion to the racist Jewish state contrasts disturbingly with their advocacy of multiculturalism for everyone else. In fact, Arabs in Israel have been imprisoned for having sexual relations with Jewish women. Yet, the Zionist advocates of multiculturalism in Europe never mention this.

Many of the video clips posted on You Tube on Jewish supremacy come from 'white identity' racist groups, which prevents a lot of people from objective and rational analysis of this phenomenon. For example, one post reads 'Jews admit to destroying the white race'. It features an interview with Barbara Lerner Spectre, the head of *Paideia*, a Jewish advocacy group in Sweden, who claims that multiculturalism is inevitable in Europe and that "Jews will be resented because of our leading role". This comes from a Zionist who previously made her *aliyah* to Israel. So, one race is to impose multiculturalism on all other races and those races who oppose the "leading role" of that race are anti-Semitic, racists!

All of this is happening as the Jewish state, through its proxy forces, systematically attacks and destroys every functioning multi-ethnic society in the developing world. For example, Libya was a multiracial society with significant immigration from Europe. Racist rumours about Gaddafi's 'black mercenaries' were used by the Zionist controlled mass media to launch a war of aggression which reduced Africa's richest and most promising nation to rubble.

Miscegenation is becoming an obsession for France's predominantly Jewish ruling class, that is to say miscegenation for the "gentiles", but not, of course, for Jews. Former French president Nicolas Sarkozy has said

that if France's multiple races do not miscegenate, the French government will have to use more "forceful methods" to implement this social policy.

White nationalists such as David Duke and Kevin MacDonald are nostalgic for the days when White Christians ruled the world, oppressing all the other races, Jews included. These writers focus exclusively on the evils of 'Jewish supremacy' while ignoring the long and brutal history of White Christian supremacy.

Furthermore, there is no class analysis in this genre of anti-Zionist discourse. Instead, their followers are led to believe that the world's problems would be solved if Jewish supremacy were defeated. But here there is no discussion of political economy. This 'white nationalist' discourse on Zionism ignores the material basis of class domination, the material structures that form the basis, the *fons et origo* for the domination of the world by Zionist bankers. In order to justify their anti-communism these authors use every Cold-War anti-communist lie from the handbook of Cold War pseudo-sovietology; lies about the Soviet Union that have long been refuted, such as the Holodomar; the Katyn Massacre; the Red Terror, the USSR's demography and penal system, and many more.

It is astonishing to find that so many people believe communism was a Jewish conpiracy and that the current political system most resembles communism. There were certainly many Jews in the Bolshevik party and Zionism was a major problem for the USSR. But anti-communists fail to realise that Lenin and the Bolshevik party conducted a long and vigorous struggle against the Jewish Bund and Leon Trotsky for many years before the October Revolution of 1917. They also fail to realise that those Jewish conspirators they call 'communists' were tried and convicted by the Soviet Government from 1936-1938, for conducting a terrorist campaign in the USSR in preparation for a *coup d'etat* following the planned Nazi invasion. There was extensive collaboration between Zionists and Nazis.

At the head of this conspiracy was Leon Trotsky. Nicolai Yezhov was the head of Soviet state security at the time. He was also a Nazi agent, who deliberately murdered thousands of innocent communists in order to turn soviet citizens against the state in preparation for a Nazi invasion.

When the Nazis finally did invade, Nazi minister of propaganda Goebbels admitted using Trotskyite propaganda in an effort to deceive Soviet workers. What anti-communists refer to as socialism is, in fact, Trotskyism. The oft-cited book by Antony Sutton *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution*, claims that Trotsky was a German agent. There is much evidence for this claim. However, the author does not claim that Lenin was agent of imperialism, as there is no evidence for this claim.

Anti-Zionists who defend capitalism would do well to read Werner Sombart's book *Die Juden und das Wirtschaftsleben* translated as *The Jews and Modern Capitalism*. Frederich Engels claimed that Sombart was the only German professor of his time who fully understood Marx's work. Sombart argues convincingly that the Jews invented modern capitalism.

While Marx certainly had Jewish roots, Engels came from a protestant family and the latter is just as important as the former for communists. Anticommunists who propagate the lie that communism was a Jewish conspiracy clearly know next to nothing about communism and the long philosophical, non-Jewish European tradition from Saint Simon and Fourrier to Thomson and Connolly, from which communist ideology stems. In fact, communism is far more Christian than Jewish. Perhaps referring to Acts 2.44, St Ambrose once wrote:

> Nature furnishes it wealth to all men in common. God beneficently has created all things that their enjoyment be common to all living beings, and that the earth become the common property of all... Only unjust usurpation has created the right of private property.

One of the slogans of the Bolsheviks upon seizing power came straight

out of Thessalonians 3.10: 'If anyone is not willing to work, let him not eat'.

Marx, in his essay, "On the Jewish Question", says that the only salvation for the Jews would be the abandonment of Judaism, which for Marx meant the ideology of usury. While Zionist intrigue did much to infiltrate the communist movement, it would be far more plausible if anti-communists were to describe the October Revolution as a Christian conspiracy, rather than a Judaic one!

However, racist theorists aside, the question of Jewish racial supremacy and the Zionist subversion of anti-racist discourse should be a matter of concern to those opposed to slavery and racism. And in this discussion the voice of non-Jews is particularly important. We are entitled to ask why Jewish supremacists such as Sarkozy, Jacques Attali and their Zionist cohorts are so enthusiastic about miscegenation for the "gentiles", while openly practicing the opposite themselves and refusing to criticize the overtly racist ideology of the Jewish state. It behooves all non Jews, Black, White, Asian or other to ponder this question.

Richard Nikolas Coudenove-Kalergi was an Austrian-Japanese politician and philosopher of Jewish descent who is often referred to as the "founding father" of the European Union. In his book *Practical Idealism,* Coudenove-Kalergi predicted that a Eurasian-Negroid race would emerge in the future from the miscegenation of all the races, thereby integrating Mackinder's "World Island" with a new Universal Race similar in appearance to the Ancient Egyptians.

It is a vision of a *Homo Novus* in a Brave New World but not all races will participate in this demotic evolution. Jews, in Coudenove-Kalergi's vision, are to become a new sacerdotal, Herrenvolk ruling over this new Eurasian-Negroid race. He writes:

> Instead of destroying European Jewry, Europe, against its own will,

> refined and educated this people into a future leader-nation through this artificial selection process. No wonder that this people, that escaped Ghetto-Prison, developed into a spiritual nobility of Europe. Therefore a gracious Providence provided Europe with a new race of nobility by the Grace of Spirit. This happened at the moment when Europe's feudal aristocracy became dilapidated, and thanks to Jewish emancipation.

It is a vision indubitably close to that of Sweden's aforementioned multicultural 'leader' Barbara Lerner Spectre.

The Coudanvoe Kalergi Prize is distributed every two years and Angela Merkel has been rewarded this prize for her services to 'European integration.

And for those who oppose this plan to ethnically cleanse all of Europe?

General Thomas PM Barnett in his book *Blueprint for Action* advocates the assassination of all those who oppose Kalergi's vision of a "multicultural" society ruled over by a Jewish nobility.

Referring specifically to resistance to this 'New World Order,' Barnett writes:

> As we seek to shrink what remains of the Gap over the next several decades, we will rarely find societies adequately prepared- either intellectually or emotionally- for the travails that lie ahead. Instead, the elements most prepared will be those most willing to wage bloody resistance against this process: educated, worldly young men who are familiar with the future we offer and have already decided that it is corrupting beyond all reason. So yes, I do account for nonrational actors in my worldview. And when they threaten violence against the global order, I say: Kill them. (p.282)

- Read Part One , Part Two, Part Three, Part Four, Part Five, and Part Six.

Gearóid Ó Colmáin is a journalist and political analyst based in Paris. His work focuses on globalization, geopolitics and class struggle. He is a regular contributor to Dissident Voice, Global Research, Russia Today International, Press TV, Sputnik Radio France, Sputnik English, Al Etijah TV, Sahar TV, and has also appeared on Al Jazeera and Al Mayadeen. He writes in English, Gaelic, and French. Read other articles by Gearóid, or visit Gearóid's website.

This article was posted on Friday, February 5th, 2016 at 6:23am and is filed under Africa, Espionage/"Intelligence", Europe, France, Germany, Mossad, Propaganda, Racism, Refugees, Zionism.

The Politics of Multiculturalism

Coercive Engineered Migration: Zionism's War on Europe (Part 8 of an 11 Part Series)

by Gearóid Ó Colmáin / February 14th, 2016

It is particularly ironic that the Zionist-controlled media are pushing the agenda of multiculturalism in Europe while insisting on the right of Israel, the world's only racist, apartheid state, to exist. At the same time, the conditions for this artificial, dystopian form of multiculturalism involve the destruction of some of the world's most successful multi-racial states such as Yugoslavia, Libya, Syria and, if they succeed, possibly Eritrea.

What we are witnessing here is a process of engineered acculturation where people are being uprooted, displaced and abandoned to the limitless tyranny of the market and commodity fetishism. The boats crossing the Mediterranean Sea are, to quote Freisleben again, 'Rothschild's slaughterships', the slave-boats of Zionism's New World Order.

Jacques Attali is one of France's most respected Zionist thinker and has been an advisor to successive French governments. He has referred to globalisation's war against the nation-state as the 'Somalisation of the world'. Attali has predicted that the Westphalian state will be destroyed during the epochal chaotic transition to a 'gouvernement mondial', a global state with Jerusalem as its capital. The idea might appear as utterly far-fetched to a reasonable person but Zionists are not reasonable people and it should be of deep concern that the world's most powerful governments are being advised by such influential racist fanatics with overtly global ambitions.

At a meeting of World Jewish Congress in 2014, Attali referred to the Jews in France as a privileged class. Therefore, in order to prevent Muslim immigrants from developing resentment of this ethnocentric class rule, Attali suggested that rich Jews should help create a French Muslim petite-bourgeoisie. They should also, he argued, finance the Imams in order to prevent objections to Zionism. In other words, an elite of French Muslims should be groomed by Zionist Jews so that they can keep the proletarian Muslims driven from North Africa and the Middle East by Zionism from overthrowing their Jewish overlords, both at home and in their countries of exile.

As the mass media drum up Islamophobia while glorifying Al-Qaida terrorists in Syria in the service of Zion, the ancillary regimes of the Jewish state, namely Qatar and Saudi Arabia, are zealously implementing Attali's suggestions. Giulio Meotti for the Israeli *National News* reports:

> A few days ago, the president of the Sorbonne, Philippe Boutry, signed an agreement with the attorney general of the state of Qatar. Within the next three years, the Islamic monarchy will finance the studies of hundreds of Syrian immigrants at the Parisian academic jewel. The Sorbonne has accepted 600,000 euros per year for three years.

Jacques Attali is on record stating the he does not consider non-Jews as human beings. The view that non-Jews are subhuman comes from Talmudism and does not necessarily represent the views of secular or Orthodox Jews. There IS a difference.

In France, the rise of the Marine Le Pen's Front National is increasing steadily. Le Pen's party appears to have the backing of a considerable portion of Zionism, which may account for why Le Pen's image and stature has dramatically improved in the French press. The Front National is now being courted by prominent public intellectuals as the party of the oppressed. Its reactionary agenda is being marketed as 'left-wing' and 'anti-globalisation'. Although Marine Le Pen opposed the war against Libya-as opposed to the Trotskyite Jean Luc Melanchon, who supported it- Le Pen has supported all other French wars of aggression in Africa, such as the French bombing and invasion of Mali and the French invasion of the Central African Republic. Nor has Le Penn ever called into question the French financial control of many Francophone neo-colonies in Africa. Le Pen is a populist playing up to popular discontent, exploiting the despair of the masses with empty slogans and a hefty dose of xenophobia, adroitly eschewing any reference to the real problem in France: capitalism.

The Europe depicted by Michel Houellebecq in his nightmarish novel *Soumission*– submission- where a French Muslim community led by a Muslim Brotherhood political party faces Marine Le Pen, is inexorably becoming a reality.

The French and European political scene is being irrevocably set for a Huntington 'clash of civilisations'. The clichéd theory of the 'Jewish conspiracy' against all non-Jews appears so crude and essentialist, so simple and vulgar in its implications, as to pass for irrational, urban and 'anti-Semitic' folklore, which, of course, it is. But objective and rational analysis of the centrality of the "Jewish question" and Zionism in the context of the current, global power-configuration is more urgent than ever. For if we do not bring Zionism under control, Zionism will eventually control us. This also applies to Jews. As Professor Yoakov Rabkin in his book *Comprendre l'Etat d'Israel: Ideologie, Religion et Societe*, argues:

> Paradoxically, Jewish nationalism is conceptually compatible with anti-Semitics theories, for it also postulates the impossibility of the Jew becoming a full and equal member of European society. History shows that the attraction of Zionism augments with the intensity of anti-Semitism or of economic difficulties, which explains the fact that relatively few British, American or French Jews have accepted the Zionist project since its inception up to to today and rarely leave their countries to settle in Israel. (p. 49)

In 2013, the European Jewish Parliament was set up by Jewish Ukrainian billionaire and (ironically) neo-Nazi Ihor Kolomoyski. While the organisation claims to be an NGO, it functions according to the structures of a veritable parliament. Why does an ethnic minority in Europe have its own parliament? Will other ethnic minorities in Europe receive their own parliament too? Perhaps Jews deserve their own European parliament because they are officially recognised as 'Europe's chosen people', as its 'constitutive minority'. That is what was said in the opening remarks of a conference held in Israel in 2013, sponsored by the Konrad Adenhauer Foundation.

Since the counter-revolutions in Eastern Europe of 1989, Jewish supremacy has accompanied the triumph of neo-liberalism and globalisation in Europe and the United States. This racial supremacy is being stealthily enshrined in US law. In 1991, the 102nd US Congress passed a resolution on the Noahide Laws. These are seven laws which Jewish rabbis believe should rule the lives of non-Jews, while Jews are to be ruled by a special set of laws.

The aforementioned racist Rabbi Manachem Mendel Schneerson, of the Lubavitch Movement, is praised in the resolution.

In 1995 Professor Ernest S. Easterly of the Southern University Law Centre presented a paper entitled "The Rule of Law and the New World Order" to the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

An expert in Jewish law, Easterly is a zealous proponent of the Noahide Laws. He referred to the passing of the laws by the US congress in 1991 as "the first rays of dawn" which "evidence the rising of a yet unseen sun". According to Micheal A. Hoffman:
The *Jewish Encyclopedia* envisages a Noahide regime as a possible world order immediately preceding the

universal reign of the Talmud.

While it is possible to simply ignore these policy documents as abberant and marginal manifestations of ruling class ideology, they nonetheless constitute a sinister form of racism and religious bigotry, one which has, to a large extent, been unperceived.

Belgian physicist Jean Bricmont was ostracized and branded an 'anti-Semite' by the French media after he argued that it is high time Zionism was discussed and debated by non-Jews. Pro-Zionist and ostensibly 'anti-Zionist' literature and discourse tends to be dominated by Jews. And many Jewish 'leftists' tend to ignore the primacy of the Jewish Lobby in the formulation of US foreign policy. Instead, they advance the theory that Israel is simply a colony of the US empire, a tool with which to control the Middle East. This is patent nonsense to anyone who has studied what sociologist James Petras refers to as the 'Zionist power-configuration' in the United States, a power-configuration that extends to Europe and beyond.

During the run-up to the Iraq war in 2003 Jewish 'leftists' blamed the US 'neo-cons' and their desire to control Iraq's oil for the drive towards war. Little or no mention was made of the fact that the real driving force behind the propaganda campaign for the war on Iraq came from the Jewish Lobby. This is amply documented in James Petras' book *The Power of Israel in the United States*.

The strategic imperatives of the Zionist entity require the division and conquest of all Arab lands, so as to clear the Middle East in preparation for expanded Israeli colonisation, as stipulated in the Yinon Plan and the project of Eretz Israel-Greater Israel. Yet we were being told by many Jewish leftists that the Iraq invasion was a 'war for oil,' in spite of the fact that Western corporations had already acquired as much Iraq oil as they could manage.

Most anti-imperialist intellectuals in the Middle East will tell you that the war against Syria is a proxy-war waged by the Jewish state in order to create the conditions of a 'New Middle East' a euphemism for Greater Israel. Yet, many Jewish critics of US policy in Syria insist that it is the United States (plus Israel). An historical analogy might be helpful here. For centuries Ireland was colonised by the British Empire. Irish farmers paid rent to British aristocrats who had dispossessed them. Ireland was impoverished from debt. Although some Irishmen played an important role in the British army and served in high office throughout the empire, no one could claim that it was the 'Irish Lobby' in London who persuaded the British to conquer India, Hong Kong or Kenya or that the Irish nation somehow benefited from those conquests. Empires exploit colonies. Colonies do no exploit empires. If Israel were a colony of the United States, then we would surely see the emergence of an Israeli national liberation movement from US exploitation and colonisation! No such movement exists.

Zionist and crypto-Zionist Jews, through their control of both the corporate and much of the 'alternative' media, have managed to play down the centrality of the Jewish state's role in America's foreign wars and the importance of Jewish 'hasbara'-propagandists and 'sayonim'- helpers in that war effort. They ignore the fact that the only state which is really benefiting from America's wars is Israel.

One might object to the thesis of Israel's power over US foreign policy by citing the very clear differences expressed by Washington and Tel Aviv regarding Iran's nuclear programme. Here, surely, one might argue, the United States is not following Israel's agenda. While Israel's Likudniks oppose the deal with Iran, more 'moderate' Zionists agree with the compromise. For Israel and the United States, the deal with Iran is but a stepping stone towards an infiltration and destabilisation of the Islamic Republic. Diplomatic and business contacts with the West will inevitably facilitate greater ideological and intelligence penetration of Iran by the US and Israel, while the proxy-terrorist groups fighting against Iran in Yemen, and Syria will continue to receive support from the Mossad and the CIA. In fact, the Zionist destabilisation of Iran has already begun. The Kurdish social movement in Iran is supported by Israel.

The litmus-test for distinguishing the genuine anti-Zionist from the crypto-Zionist is the question of Israel's relationship to the United States and Europe. As for the independent media, one will often find that the bullying

and derisive techniques of the corporate media to discredit dissidents are employed to discredit those who would dig too deeply into the Zionist machinations of US imperialism. The fallacy of *reductio ad absurdum* is a particularly common technique. This usually involves discrediting an anti-Zionist theory by falsely implying that the proponent of that theory believes in the supernatural, that he is a deranged simpleton who believes the world is run by goblins and such like. Another technique is the *reductio ad Hitlerum*, whereby those who discuss the problem of Jewish supremacy are compared to racists such as Adolf Hitler.

Jewish 'anti-imperialist' pundits regularly become 'leaders' and 'gurus' of 'leftist' movements and often use their credibility to police how issues of ethnicity, class and nationalism are conceptualized and discussed. Once people among their 'ranks' probe too deeply into Zionist intrigue, Zionist racial supremacy, warning signals are promptly sent out of a 'far right' and 'fascist' infiltration of the 'movement', this in spite of the fact that 'fascism' is precisely what genuine anti-Zionists are denouncing.

Such techniques sometimes work but more often than not, they only draw more attention to the suspicion among non Jewish critics of Zionism that an attempt is being made by 'leftist' Jews to deflect attention from the real sources of power in the capitalist world order, namely the Zionist power configuration.

It is therefore important for such individuals to occasionally re-emphasise their 'opposition' to Israel. In this sense, the Jewish 'anti-imperialist' bears a striking resemblance to the spokesmen of the Islamic State.

For what is the Islamic State or Da'esh other than the foreign legion of Israel. They have achieved in little time what no other Israeli proxy-force could have achieved. They have cleared vast territories of Iraq and Syria, have attacked Hamas in Gaza and have conveniently occupied the Sinai peninsula in Egypt. It is perhaps more apposite than ironic that security experts also refer to the Mossad as ISIS, Israel's Secret Intelligence Service. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that official UN documents confirm Israel is covertly supporting Da'esh.

Like the Jewish pseudo anti-imperialists, the spokesmen of the Islamic State always refer to their hatred for "America" and the "freedoms of Americans" as the reason for their crusade. They do not seem to be too concerned about Israel, except, of course, when they miraculously manage to stage terrorist attacks on European soil, which often take place in formerly Jewish owned properties. Such attacks foment Islamophobia and the notion that Jews are hated and in danger, an agenda which serves Zionist regional and global hegemonic ambitions. In this sense one could argue that both the Islamic State and crypto-Zionists serve the same purpose: constantly deflecting attention from Zionism by blaming Israel's giant, stultified Leviathan — the United States of America.

• Read Part One, Part Two, Part Three, Part Four, Part Five, Part Six, and Part Seven.

Gearóid Ó Colmáin is a journalist and political analyst based in Paris. His work focuses on globalization, geopolitics and class struggle. He is a regular contributor to Dissident Voice, Global Research, Russia Today International, Press TV, Sputnik Radio France, Sputnik English, Al Etijah TV, Sahar TV, and has also appeared on Al Jazeera and Al Mayadeen. He writes in English, Gaelic, and French. Read other articles by Gearóid, or visit Gearóid's website.

This article was posted on Sunday, February 14th, 2016 at 8:27am and is filed under CIA, Espionage/"Intelligence", Europe, Fascism, France, Iran, Iraq, Israel/Palestine, Mossad, Propaganda, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syria, The Lobby, Zionism.

All content © 2007-2019 Dissident Voice and respective authors | | Top

On the Question of Imperialism

Coercive Engineered Migration: Zionism's War on Europe (Part 9 of an 11 Part Series)

by Gearóid Ó Colmáin / March 6th, 2016

Is Russia Imperialist?

There is much confusion as to the nature of imperialism. Many analysts contend that there is only one form of imperialism in the world today, namely NATO and that countries such as Russia and China are the leaders of a global anti-imperialist front, resisting domination by the Western corporate elite. However, such as theory does not stand up to scrutiny. In his book *Imperialism: the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Vladimir Lenin defined imperialism as monopoly capitalism. He writes:

> If it were necessary to give the briefest possible definition of imperialism we should have to say that imperialism is the monopoly stage of capitalism. Such a definition would include what is most important, for, on the one hand, finance capital is the bank capital of a few very big monopolist banks, merged with the capital of the monopolist associations of industrialists; and, on the other hand, the division of the world is the transition from a colonial policy which has extended without hindrance to territories unseized by any capitalist power, to a colonial policy of monopolist possession of the territory of the world, which has been completely divided up.

Both Russia and China are dominated by monopoly capitalist and state-monopoly capitalist enterprises. In Russia, state-monopoly capitalism has been a reality since the Khrushchev reforms of 1957, which changed the Soviet Union's economy from socialist to a state-capitalist mode of production, while China, from the days of Mao's 'New Democracy' to Xi Jinping today, has always pursued varying forms of state-monopoly capitalism.

As the foreign relations of Russia and China are based on protecting the interests of their respective monopoly enterprises; their foreign relations are *strictu sensu* imperialist. This is a far cry from the Soviet Union from 1917 to 1953, when proletarian internationalism constituted the basis of Soviet foreign policy. This is the only period in modern history when Russian foreign policy has been anti-imperialist. For example, when Enver Hoxha, First Secretary of Albania's Party of Labour, visited Josef Stalin in Moscow in 1946, the Soviet leader offered to supply Albania with all the necessary materials and expertise for its rapid industrialization. Stalin emphasized the importance for Albania of developing heavy industry so as to create the means of production necessary for economic self-sufficiency. Here credit and loans did not even enter the equation. All this changed when Nikita Khrushchev took over. Instead of encouraging socialist countries to industrialise and become self-sufficient, Khrushchev's policy was to capture markets for Soviet exports. When the Albanians objected to this policy the Khrushchevites threatened and harassed the Albanian government. Hoxha writes:

> There was something wrong, there was no longer that former atmosphere, when we would go to Stalin and open our hearts to him without hesitation and he would listen and speak to us just as

> frankly from his heart, the heart of an internationalist communist. More and more each day, in his successors, instead of communists, we saw hucksters.

The new Soviet capitalist foreign policy was also criticised by Che Guevara, who complained that the Khushchevite 'hucksters' were more interested in selling arms for a profit than voluntarily supplying arms on the basis of proletarian internationalism. That is why Hoxha correctly described the USSR in this period as 'social imperialist'; that is to say, state-monopoly capitalism or imperialism disguised as socialism. During the 1960s the revisionist USSR shamelessly delivered weapons to the fascist military regime in Indonesia while they murdered all those associated with Indonesia's communist party.

Khrushchevite revisionism destroyed the USSR's economy, a civilisation that was, until Stalin's death, the hope of workers all over the world. Contrary to popular belief, it was not socialism which collapsed in 1991, but rather Soviet state capitalism, which under the influence of Zionist oligarchs, embraced neoliberalism by destroying all state obstacles to the total exploitation of the workers. Many of the oligarchs who took over the former Soviet territory were former convicts in labour camps, imprisoned for defrauding the soviet System.

The destruction of the USSR was, as Putin has correctly pointed out, the greatest catastrophe of the twentieth century. The violent coup against the Russian parliament in 1993 was led by fascists no different in outlook to the hooligans who took over Kiev in 2014. Russian economist Sergei Glayev, in his book *Genocide: Russia and the New World Order* eloquently describes the ideology of the Yeltsinites:

> The subjective disposition of the ideologues of the contemporary revolution in Russia, strongly recalls, in the hatred and contempt for the people of their own country, Hitler's propaganda or Trotskyite agitation. (*Genocide: Russia and the New World Order*, p 6).

Under Yeltsin's dictatorship Russia lost millions of its people due to economic hardship, a silent and hidden genocide. Sergei Glayev writes:

> The total excess of the number of deaths over the number of births in the 1992-1997 period is estimated at 3,890,000 persons. At the same time, Russia's overall demographic losses for those years, as a consequence of the deterioration of the social and economic situation and the destruction of a normal cultural and daily life environment, are estimated at 8 million people, of which approximately 3 million died prematurely and 5 million were not born, due to the sharp decline of childbearing.

Glayev refers to the racist 'Talmudic ideology' of Russia's post Soviet ruling elite, who ruled as 'chosen ones' for whom ordinary Russians were considered subhuman, 'white slaves'.

It is out of this nightmare that Russian president Vladimir Putin arose.

Putin is a creature of Gorbachev's USSR, which is why the former USSR leader whom communists want to prosecute for high treason, supports the current Russian incumbent.

Putin is on record stating that he supported Mikhail Gorbachev during the coup against the latter in 1991. The coup was an attempt to save the Soviet Union whose loss Putin would subsequently lament.

In a recent interview, Putin referred to Nikita Khruschchev as a "great leader" who made the world respect Russia. This is not an opinion shared by communists in the former Soviet Union. In his book, *Khrushchev and the Destruction of the USSR*, Mikhail Kilev, shows that in order to restore capitalism in the USSR, Khrushchev lied about Stalin, blaming him for many of the crimes he and his cronies had committed. Khrushchev's anti-communist policies were a disaster for the USSR, plunging the economy into deep crisis, enabling a caste of corrupt apparatchiks to come to power, demoralising the workers and creating the conditions for total counter-revolution under the neo-liberal regime of Yeltsin. The lies and crimes of Nikita Khrushchev are also well documented by

Grover Furr in his book *Khrushchev Lied: The Evidence That Every "Revelation" of Stalin's (and Beria's) Crimes in Nikita Khrushchev's Infamous "Secret Speech" to the 20th Party Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on February 25, 1956, is Provably False.*

Putin is wrong. Nikita Krushchev was not a great leader. On the contrary, he was among the greatest villians of Modern Russian history and Putin shows disrespect for the Russian people in referring to such a vile traitor of Russian and Soviet workers.

Since taking power, Putin has many notable achievements under his belt. He has restored the economy, protected the country's unity against NATO proxy war in Chechnya and has imprisoned or expelled some of the most notorious Zionist oligarchs from the country such as Vladimir Guzinsky and Mikhail Khodorskovsky. Putin's leadership has seen the emergence of a national, patriotic bourgeoisie. This protection of national interests has led to confrontation with NATO, who are openly conspiring to dismember the Russian Federation. However, labour conditions in Putin's Russia remain appalling with average life expectancy of Russian males at 56 years. The average standard of living and industrial output still lags far behind the Soviet Union.

The Russian people are still living under a brutal class dictatorship and the thousands of Russians who demonstrate every year with portraits of Lenin and Stalin are proof that class-conscious Russians do not believe the bourgeois state's official anti-communist propaganda. Many of those demonstrators remember better times when proletarian democracy triumphed over bourgeois exploitation. To suggest therefore, that Putin is at the head of an 'anti-imperialist' alliance is fantasy. The Russian imperial state is, however, observing the rules and protocols of international diplomacy and is thus the guarantor of the security of client-states such as Syria. This is in stark contrast to the lawlessness, anarchy and genocide being spread by the United States. Russia is, therefore, playing a defensive role and should be commended for its observance of international law.

Is China Imperialist?

China is also an emerging empire. In the first decade after the liberation of the country by the communists, China gained important technology transfers from the USSR. However, with the rise of Soviet Revisionism, that transfer stopped. But China had sufficient means by then to industrialise on its own, with concentration on heavy industry, thus enabling China to become an independent industrial power. Although Mao claimed to uphold the principles of Marxism-Leninism, his policies show that he favoured an alliance of the progressive bourgeoisie with the peasants and workers. Mao's decentralised, commune-based, class alliance referred to as 'New Democracy', was far closer to his predecessor Sun Yat-sen, than Marxism-Leninism, whose principles require the dictatorship of the proletariat and the poor peasantry over all classes. As Bill Bland shows in his book *The Class Struggle in China* Mao Zedong represented the comprador bourgeois faction in the Communist Party while Kao Kang, who was sidelined and later possibly murdered, advocated proletarian dictatorship.

Mao's opening up to the USA in 1972 accelerated the super-exploitation of the Chinese proletariat. Mao's revisionist government had no hesitation in maintaining diplomatic relations with the fascist Pinochet regime in Chile. The Chinese social imperialists also bear some responsibility for the rise of Al Qaida in Afghanistan, as they sold arms to the Mujahedeen during the 1980s. However, in China's case, Islamist terrorism in the Xinjiang province is more a case of blowback than Islamist terrorism in the West, which is predominantly false-flag. In other words the Chinese People's Liberation Army is genuinely fighting Islamist terrorism in Xinjiang province.

Although China's presence in Africa as a competitor with US imperialism is enabling important industrial development, China's interest in Africa is purely commercial and is based in exploiting resources and labour for the benefit of state-monopoly capitalism. It is therefore ludicrous to describe China as 'anti-imperialist'. As a competing empire in Africa offering better contracts and a policy of non-interference, China offers Africa's national bourgeoisies the opportunity to escape from the clutches of European and American neo-colonialism by becoming client states of Chinese imperialism. While such as move is progressive, it does not remove the problem of

imperialism.

Is Iran imperialist?

As for the other actors in the Syrian conflict, a few comments need to be made about the role the Islamic Republic of Iran and Hezbollah. It should not be overlooked that Iran and Lebanese Hezbollah collaborated with the United States in supporting Islamist terrorism in Bosnia during the Yugoslav wars in 1992, a policy which subsequently back-fired when the independent Bosnian regime voted for sanctions against Iran in the UN. The Islamic Republic of Iran, whose Khomeinist ideology ostensibly supported the struggles of the poor and the oppressed nations, completely misunderstood the nature of the Balkan conflict, falling for Zionist propaganda about the wars being a Christian plot to oust Muslims from Europe. Bosnian leader Alija Izetbegovic's delegations to Iran and Libya played on this deception, thereby feeding the notion of a 'clash of civilisations' between the Muslim and Christian worlds. The theological and anti-Marxist postulates of the Islamic Republic of Iran made it a prime target of this Zionist ideological obfuscation.

In 2011, in spite of the obvious Zionist role in the Arab Spring, Tehran gave its full support to the uprisings in North Africa. During the Zionist bombing of Libya, Iranian state-media agencies continued to refer to the Islamist terrorists as 'revolutionaries'. Lebanon's militia Hezbollah also cheered on the Al Qaida terrorists in Libya. In fact, the Chinese and Russian UN Security Council abstentions, together with Iranian and Hezbollah support for the terrorists, meant that Libya had to face the full force of world Zionism on its own for over eight months. Many see Lebanese Hezbollah as an 'anti-imperialist' and 'anti-Zionist' organisation. While they are certainly playing an important role in the liberation of Syria from Zionist-Wahhabite aggression and have defended Lebanon from Israeli occupation and bombing, their role during the Arab Spring in 2011 needs to be highlighted here.

In a televised speech on March 19th, 2011, Hezbollah's leader Sayed Hassan Nasrallah praised the Arab uprisings in North Africa and the Arabian peninsula and stated that any suggestion that the uprisings were backed by the United States was incorrect and unjust. He justified this interpretation on the basis of fact that all the toppled regimes had been collaborators with the United States. Nasrallah had fallen for Zionism's great deception, for we have proven since 2011 that the Arab Spring was a well thought-out, well executed geostrategic project to design a New Middle East in accordance with Israeli hegemony.

Nasrallah was wrong to suggest that the North African regimes were total collaborators with US imperialism. There were grave differences between Mubarak and the United States concerning the war on Iraq, the partition of Sudan and the war on terrorism. Ben Ali of Tunisia had also repeatedly criticised US double standards in dealing with the Middle East. As for Muammar Gaddafi, his entire pan-Africanist project was a major threat to US imperial interests. Nasrallah did much to sell the Arab Spring to his audience, even quoting the lies diffused by the Western corporate press for emphasis. It is difficult to believe he could have fallen for such risible nonsense. The fact that Nasrallah did not investigate Zionism's role in these uprisings and that he watched the slaughter of Libya and celebrated the brutal murder of Gaddafi should not be forgotten in our assessment of his 'anti-imperialism'.

While the Islamic Republic of Iran is not yet a major world empire, it is an emerging capitalist power pursuing a foreign policy according to its strategic and ideological interests. In this sense, Iranian capitalism does qualify for the status of emerging empire. However, Iran and Hezbollah are currently playing a highly constructive role in defending the Syrian Arab Republic, while Iran's new and expanding foreign language media outlets provide space for more inclusive and truthful debate in the West.

Conclusion

The people of Russia, China and Iran have every reason to blame their own governments for allowing the 2011 crisis in Libya to escalate. Had those countries backed Gadaffi, the Syrian terrorists would have been denied a major base of operations against Damascus, thus also making Russia, China and Iran more secure. In fact, the abstention of Russia and China and Iran's support for the counter-revolution in Libya could be described as acts of

unpardonable diplomatic stupidity or worse still, acts of high treason, given the fact that all three emerging powers are facing Al Qaida insurgencies inside their own borders.

The emergence of Russia, China and Iran as global powers is a positive development insofar as it curbs the drive of NATO for total, unipolar, global domination. But none of these powers can seriously claim to be 'anti-imperialist'.

• Read Part One, Part Two, Part Three, Part Four, Part Five, Part Six, Part Seven, Part Eight.

Gearóid Ó Colmáin is a journalist and political analyst based in Paris. His work focuses on globalization, geopolitics and class struggle. He is a regular contributor to Dissident Voice, Global Research, Russia Today International, Press TV, Sputnik Radio France, Sputnik English, Al Etijah TV, Sahar TV, and has also appeared on Al Jazeera and Al Mayadeen. He writes in English, Gaelic, and French. Read other articles by Gearóid, or visit Gearóid's website.

This article was posted on Sunday, March 6th, 2016 at 9:13am and is filed under Afghanistan, China, Imperialism, Iran, Libya, NATO, Russia, Syria, Zionism.

All content © 2007-2019 Dissident Voice and respective authors | | Top

President Vladimir Putin: An Enigma

Coercive Engineered Migration: Zionism's War on Europe (Part 10 of an 11 Part Series)

by Gearóid Ó Colmáin / March 15th, 2016

Winston Churchill once described the Soviet Union as a 'puzzle wrapped inside an enigma'. The same could be said for Russian President Vladimir Putin today. From the intricate and sometimes unpredictable diplomatic maneuvers of his foreign policy to his contradictory and sometimes ambiguous pronouncements on the legacy of the USSR, enigmatic is perhaps one of the most apposite words to describe him. This enigma is particularly evident in his approach to the politics of the Middle East and Israel in particular.

A further complication in the notion of a contemporary Russian bourgeois state representing some form of 'anti-imperialist' resistance is the Kremlin's Middle East policy. In spite of Russia's support for the Syrian Arab Republic against Zionist-led aggression, Vladimir Putin has openly and repeatedly expressed his support for Israel.

This has led to conflicts with many actors in Russia's foreign policy elite who are said to be more pro-Palestinian. It is likely that Putin's support for the existence of the Jewish state goes back to the USSR's initial support for the creation of Israel in 1948, where the Soviet government believed a socially orientated, Soviet friendly, inclusive state in Palestine would be in the USSR's best interests, also perhaps divesting the Soviet hierarchy of the problem of Jewish 'over-representation', the source of much suspicion and hatred among Russia's ethnic slaves, many of whom believed communism was a 'Jewish conspiracy'.

Putin's pro-Israeli stance is said to have been copper fastened through his alleged close relationship with former Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon.

Before falling ill, Sharon made the following astonishing statement in front of a visibly irate Benjamin Netanyahu:

> That we cannot continue holding under occupation… and it is occupation, you might not like this word, but it's really an occupation – to hold 3.5 million Palestinians under occupation, is, in my opinion, a very bad thing. It cannot continue for ever. Do you want to remain, for ever, in Jenin, in Nablus, in Ramallah, in Bethlehem, for ever?

While Putin's ambiguous relationship with Israel contradicts the Kremlin's policy of supporting the Syrian Arab Republic's resistance to Zionist genocide, there may be deeper, more complex and hitherto undisclosed reasons for this ostensibly contradictory policy. Still, class antagonism in contemporary Russia is further aggravated among Russians by the widespread perception that an ethnic minority holds the levers of economic power in the country. A recent study by Lenta.Ru website revealed that almost a quarter of Russian oligarchs are Jewish.

While the report was criticized for ethnicizing class conflict, it nevertheless attests to the deep ambiguity of Russia's relationship to Zionism, given the fact that so many Jewish oligarchs in Russia hold Israeli passports.

The massive concentration of wealth in the hands of a few Jewish oligarchs in Russia contrasts markedly with the relative poverty of so many Jews in the Zionist colony in Palestine.

This shows once again that the only salvation for Jews, as Marx argued, is the abandonment of Judaism, or rather in this case Zionism, and the embrace of communism. The Zionist entity is not only an enemy of all non-Jews, it is forcing millions of its own 'chosen people' to live in relative poverty, proving once again, contrary to Talmudists, the Marxist thesis that the real problem in the world is not race but class struggle and exploitation of man by man..

I have already mentioned the facinorous influence of the Chabad Loubavitch sect in promoting Jewish supremacy and talmudic dictatorship. During the 1930s the Loubavitch sect was expelled from the USSR as it was considered a racist and fascist movement. However, since the rise of Gorbachev in the 1980s, the Chabad Loubavitch movement has gained considerable influence in Russia. In fact, under President Putin, Berel Lazar, the leader of the Russian Chabad Loubavitch movement, was made Chief Rabbi of Russia. Lazar has also been given many honours and decorations by the Russian state, this in spite of the fact that he belongs to a sect that openly promotes the idea among Jews that they are a master race and that all other races are sub-human. However, the Russian state has thus far managed to bring the Zionist movement under state control. This contrasts markedly with the Zionist movement in the United States and Europe, where national parliaments have become 'Israeli occupied territories'.

Anti-communist lies about religion

Putin has done much to restore Russian pride and patriotism. But the Russian president has repeatedly perpetuated lies about Russia's communist past that harm all Russians and dishonours the heroic achievements of the Red Army in liberating Europe and the world from fascism. For example, during his visit to Poland in 2010, the Russian president made an official apology for the so-called Katyn Massacre of Polish soldiers by the Red Army in Soviet occupied Poland during the Second World War.

This is a big lie, one which is fueling neo-Nazi gangs today in Zionist occupied Ukraine. Russian and American historians have proven that the crime was carried out by Nazis and blamed on the USSR.

The perpetuation of anti-communist lies and myths constitute the only obstacles between Russia's emergence as the world's leading super-power and mediocrity. It seems there is a deep tension in the attitude of Putin and his generation, misinformed for years by Soviet revisionism, regarding this issue. In spite of trading Russian pride for politically correct anti-Soviet lies with the purpose of gaining diplomatic advantages, Putin has, on the contrary, actively supported the highlighting of the achievements of the USSR in Russian school history books. This is a highly positive development.

Putin openly proclaims his Orthodox Faith. This has given him much credibility among those who value the cultural and spiritual importance of Russian Orthodox Christianity in shaping Russian identity. However, the Russian President has falsely claimed that the USSR persecuted Orthodox Christians. Article 124 of the 1936 Soviet Constitution states:

> In order to ensure to citizens freedom of conscience, the church in the U.S.S.R. is separated from the state, and the school from the church. Freedom of religious worship and freedom of antireligious propaganda is recognized for all citizens.

There were many well researched books published in the 1930s debunking claims by the pro-Fascist press in the West on the persecution of religious orders in the Soviet Union.

In fact, some religious authorities who were critical of the Soviet System were awarded the highest honours of the state. For example, the Russian Orthodox priest and surgeon Archbishop Luka Voyno Yasnetsky was awarded the Stalin Prize in 1946 for his achievements in medicine. If religious personalities in the USSR were 'persecuted', it

was due to their political counter-revolutionary activities in violation of Soviet law, and not their legally constituted right to worship nor their freedom of expression and assembly guaranteed by article 125 of the Soviet Constitution of 1936.

And, it must be said that Soviet Law was far more progressive than laws in capitalist countries. For example, the USSR became the first country in history to abolish the death penalty in 1946. The law was only later abrogated due to the capitalist decision to declare a 'Cold War' on the USSR.

Putin's Orthodox piety was severely tarnished when the obscene wealth of Patriarch Kirill was discovered by Russian media. The Patriarch is not only wealthy. He is allegedly a billionaire who appears in photos with watches worth over 30,000 Euro, more money than most working class Russians can ever hope to earn in a year. How can someone with such a disgusting lust for money and luxury be considered a 'spiritual' leader?

The question of immigration

I have already shown that views on race, nationality and identity in the context of immigration differ in former popular democracies and the former USSR. The Soviet Union and the Eastern Block were not subject to political correctness or 'Cultural Marxism' that prevailed in the bourgeois democracies of the West. This forthright, non-complex view of identity was recently expressed by Czech president Milos Zeman when he pointed out that the Czechoslovak Republic had no problem welcoming and assimilating refuges from war-torn Vietnam in accordance with the country's anti-racist and internationalist policy.

Notwithstanding Zeman's Islamophobia, he makes a crucial point about the importance of understanding the historical position of 'social-democracy' *vis-a-vis* immigration, a position obscured by political correctness and the racist demagoguery of the far right.

Zeman has described the current mass movement of migrants to Europe as a conspiracy of the Muslim Brotherhood to wage war on Europe's national cultures.

One should clarify here that national cultures in the Marxist-Leninist definition are usually composed of many races. Stalin, in his essay 'Marxism and The National Question' defined the nation thus:

> A nation is a historically constituted, stable community of people, formed on the basis of a common language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up manifested in a common culture.

There are no doubt elements of this Weltanshauung in the Russian government's approach to the question of immigration and national identity. In a recent press conference with Hungarian Prime Minister Victor Orban, Putin was asked if he shared Orban's view of migration and national identity. The Russian president replied that their views were quite similar.

In 2012, Putin said the following about immigration:

> The melting pot of assimilation is highly volatile – pushed to its limits by the ever-increasing migration flow. In politics this has found reflection in a "multiculturalism" which denies integration through assimilation. Although it makes the "minorities right to be distinct" absolute, it does little to balance this with public, behavioural or cultural commitments to the population and society as a whole. Closed ethnic-religious communities that form in many countries refuse not only to assimilate but even to adapt.
>
> There are neighbourhoods and whole towns where generations of new arrivals live on benefits and do not speak the language of the country in which they live. The growth of xenophobia among the population and harsh attempts to protect their interests, jobs and social benefits from

> "immigrant rivals" is the response seen in this behavioural model. People, shocked by what they perceive as aggressive pressure on their traditions or way of life, feel a genuine fear of losing their national identity.

Here we see expression of a bourgeois, patriotic view of immigration, which prioritises social cohesion over the anarchy of the market, whose vulture capitalists promote infinite mass immigration in order to drive down the price of labour. Yet Marxists in the West tend to support the self same policies of these oligarchs when it comes to immigration, calling for 'open borders'. This petty bourgeois Marxism tends to emphasise the merits of multiculturalism rather than what Marx and Engels described as a form of class warfare whereby the ruling class crushes national organised labour through the influx of desperately poor migrants. Engels in his book *The Condition of the Working Class in England* describes how the immigration of brutalised Irish paupers to England sabotaged English working class militancy and was a key component of class divide and rule. The difference between Engels' view of this problem, however, and the racist views of Carlyle whom he quotes, is that Engels' shows the class function of immigration and the necessity for workers to understand that the ruling class and not the migrants are to blame.

In 1870 Marx wrote:

> Introducing into the local labour market foreign labour lowers wages and alonside that the material, moral and cultural position of the indigenous working class.

If one reads the minutes of the General Council of the First International 1866-1888, one of the problems discussed was the importation by the bosses of Belgian workers into England who were prepared to work for lower rates. Here we can read that the 'General Council committed itself to use its influence to prevent the importation of any more Belgian workers at reduced prices.' Marx repeatedly warned about, and denounced the weaponization of, foreign workers against domestic labour. Marx also pointed out that foreign workers resident in the country would suffer most from coercive engineered migration. When tailors in Britain formed unions in 1865, the capitalists immediately attempted to crush the unions by importing cheap labour from Germany. Denouncing this policy Marx wrote:

> No one would suffer more than the German workers themselves, who constitute in Great Britain a larger number than the workers of all the other Continental nations. And the newly-imported workers, being completely helpless in a strange land, would soon sink to the level of pariahs.

Marx described these migrants as 'obedient mercenaries of capital in its struggle against labour'. It was important, he insisted, to explain this policy of weaponising migration to both domestic and migrant workers, so that either migrants would be discouraged from coming or would demand equal wages to indigenous workers upon arrival in their country of settlement.[1]

Liberal leftists and Trotskyite 'Marxists' approach the problem of migration through bourgeois categories. They, therefore, frenziedly accuse anyone who disagrees with their phony 'internationalism' as 'racist' and 'fascist', playing into the hands of international finance capitalists and oligarchs such as George Soros and the Zionist mafia. This superficial and spurious utopianism has nothing to do with scientific socialist thought, which requires concrete, historical and dialectical analysis of all phenomena. It is therefore correct for a Marxist to concur on the question of immigration with some of the views of bourgeois, patriotic leaders such as Vladimir Putin and Victor Orban. Protecting nation states from coercive engineered migration is in the interest of workers everywhere.

Putin's position on immigration is also an example of the country's resistance to Zionist oligarch's such as George Soros, who are promoting 'open borders' for their 'open markets'.

The problem of Nazism and historiography

Putin has repeatedly warned about the recrudescence of Nazi ideology in Eastern Europe, which is spreading with the full complicity of the European Union and the United States. The Nazis who took power in Kiev in the US backed Putsch of 2014 are a case in point. Nazi commemoration ceremonies are now commonplace in the Baltic States, while Bosniak Waffen SS Hamzar Division parades have taken place in the predominantly Muslim populated Sanzhak region of Serbia.

The rise of neo-Nazism in Eastern Europe and the EU's complicity in promoting and abetting anti-Russian jingoism is well documented and represents a grave threat to the national security of the Russian Federation. No country suffered more during the Second World War than the USSR. Over 27 million soviet citizens died. Many of them were Jews. However, the Russian government's attempt to ban questioning of any aspect of the Nazi persecution of Jews during the Second World War is bad policy and will only fuel neo-Nazism rather than contain it. It is also a further indication that Russia is, to a certain extent ,under the pervasive influence of Zionism. All historical facts are open to question and revision. Historical 'truth' should be argued among historians,not subject to juridical decrees.

Conclusion: Aggressive and defensive empires

My criticism in this series of articles of the Russian and Chinese governments in no way implies that such countries are to be considered on the same par with NATO. While both countries are defending their imperial interests, neither Russia nor China are responsible for the current fomentation of international terrorism and war, which are products of NATO and the Western Zionist axis. It is therefore coherent to support Russia and China in their defense of world order and international law when the choice is between that and total destruction of the planet under NATO hegemony.

While a unipolar world is the worst of all scenarios, a multipolar world will not prevent war in the long term either. World War I broke out in a world divided between several empires. While the Western imperial alliance is plagued by internal dissensions such as the rivalry between the United States and Europe and inter-European rivalry between Germany, France and the United Kingdom, the oriental imperial alliance is also fraught with internal rivalries and contradictions.

But there is another, equally important difference between the oriental and occidental imperial blocks; namely, the predominance of Zionism in shaping the foreign policy of the latter.

Marxists would therefore be wrong to put Russia and China on an equal footing with NATO. In all of the wars we have seen since the dissolution of the USSR, NATO and not Russia or China has been the aggressor. An instructive historical example of how Russian imperialism could be conceptualised today is provided by an article written by Josef Stalin in 1934. In the article Stalin criticises Frederich Engels exaggerated condemnation of Tzarist Russian imperialism thus:

> Characterising the predatory policy of Russian Tsarism and correctly showing the abominable nature of this policy, Engels explained it not so much by the "need" of the military-feudal-mercantile upper circles of Russia for outlets to the sea, sea-ports, for extending foreign trade and dominating strategic points, as by the circumstance that there stood at the head of Russia's foreign policy, an all-powerful and very talented band of foreign adventurers, who succeeded everywhere and in everything, who, in wonderful fashion managed to overcome each and every obstacle in the way of their adventurist purpose, who deceived with astonishing cleverness, all the Governments of Europe, and finally brought it about that Russia became a most powerful state, from the point of military strength.

Against Engels, Stalin correctly pointed out that the struggle for colonies by Britain, France and European powers, coupled with capitalism's drive for new markets, were the principal causes of the First World War. The Soviet leader showed that Engels' exaggeration of Russian imperialism was used as the justification by Social Democrats

in Germany for their chauvinist pro-war policy. Such an analysis is relevant to our attitude to the imperialist wars of today.

While one must not ignore the fact that Russia is an imperial power with ambiguous links to the Zionist entity, we must never overlook the fact that it is the foreign policy establishment of the NATO countries who are, to paraphrase Engels, operating like a 'secret Jesuit order' against the security of mankind. In this sense, we must fully support Russia's intervention in Syria as a legitimate act of self-defense perfectly in accordance with international law and the maintenance of stability, as stability, rule of law and peace are in the best interests of Russian, Syrian and all the world's workers.

Read Part One, Part Two, Part Three, Part Four, Part Five, Part Six, Part Seven, Part Eight, Part Nine

1. Classic Marxist Texts On Immigration- The New World Order and the Politics of Mass Immigration. VN Gelis, S Lawrence. [↩]

Gearóid Ó Colmáin is a journalist and political analyst based in Paris. His work focuses on globalization, geopolitics and class struggle. He is a regular contributor to Dissident Voice, Global Research, Russia Today International, Press TV, Sputnik Radio France, Sputnik English, Al Etijah TV, Sahar TV, and has also appeared on Al Jazeera and Al Mayadeen. He writes in English, Gaelic, and French. Read other articles by Gearóid, or visit Gearóid's website.

This article was posted on Tuesday, March 15th, 2016 at 4:47am and is filed under Capitalism, China, Germany, Israel/Palestine, NATO, Poland, Propaganda, Russia, Syria, Zionism.

All content © 2007-2019 Dissident Voice and respective authors | | Top

Zionism: Imperialism in the Age of Counter-revolution

Coercive Engineered Migration: Zionism's War on Europe (Part 11 of an 11 Part Series)

by Gearóid Ó Colmáin / April 11th, 2016

During the 1920s General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union Josef Stalin formulated what he considered to be the essential contribution of Lenin to Marxist political economy. Leninism, he wrote, is Marxism in the era of proletarian revolution. Since 1989 proletarian and national liberation revolutions throughout the world have been overturned by a general, global counter-revolutionary upsurge. It is a a political phenomenon that has seen the onslaught of US colour revolutions, which seek to do away with the bourgeois nation-state itself, the last barrier to the total exploitation of the world by the global corporate and financial elite.

In this essay I have argued that the contemporary form of this counter-revolutionary ideology, of this imperial drive for global domination, is Zionism. One could therefore, echoing Stalin's definition of Leninism, assert that Zionism is imperialism in the age of capitalist counter-revolution. In other words, Zionism is the very form of contemporary Western imperialism. However, unlike Russian and Chinese imperialism, Western imperialism or Zionism has both a religious and ethnic

dimension. Zionism is a Messianic and racist ideology which is not based simply on secular, Jewish nationalism but has its roots in Talmudism.

Zionism, through its control of Western finance capitalism, is striving for global governance. Lenin, writing in 1915, described as 'indisputable' the fact that 'development is proceeding towards monopolies, hence, towards a single world monopoly, towards a single world trust'. But Lenin also pointed out that this drive towards unipolar global power would also intensify the contradictions in the global economy. A cogent example of this today is the low-intensity covert war currently being waged by the United States/Israel against Germany: The Western imperial alliance is turning on itself.

However, no people's resistance to Zionism can be mounted if the empire continues to outsmart its opponents. The aforementioned General Barnett understands his enemies well. He used to teach Marxism in Harvard university and has written a book comparing the African policies of the German Democratic Republic and the Socialist Republic of Romania. In his book *Blueprint For Action*, he points out that the father of Fourth Generation Warfare is Mao Zedong. Imperial grand strategy is now waging war using techniques developed during the Chinese revolution, one of the greatest anti-colonial struggles in history. The key for anti-imperialist resistance today, therefore, has to be to understand how to turn the tools of imperialism against imperialism.

Marxism is an indispensable tool for understanding capitalism, but is insufficient for a full comprehension of the complexities of imperial strategy and tactics in the information age. Barnett and many other US and Israeli military strategists are keen students of social psychology, and in particular General Boyd's OODA Loop Theory. The OODA stands for observation, orientation, decision, action. According to Boyd, decision-making occurs in a recurring cycle of observe-orient-decide-act. An entity (whether an individual or an organization) that can process this cycle

quickly, observing and reacting to unfolding events more rapidly than an opponent, can thereby "get inside" the opponent's decision cycle and gain the advantage.

One could see this psychology at work during the Arab Spring. The rigid ideological orientation of the average 'leftist' saw the uprisings in Tunisia as proof that people were rebelling against a US-backed dictator and his 'neo-liberal' regime. This interpretation was reinforced by strategically placed 'critics' of US-foreign policy in the news station of Zionism's ancillary regime, Qatar, while the initial indifference of the Western press confirmed the interpretation of the Tunisian revolt as a genuine, grass roots uprising against US imperialism.

US and Israeli strategists were capable of doing this through their deep understanding of 'leftist' discourse. They also understood that the 'anti-globalisation' form of the protest movement would fool genuine critics of US imperialism, thereby impeding their ability to react to the US-orchestrated revolutions in a rational manner.

In the Arab Spring, inverted Marxian dialectics, Systems Theory, Psychology, Military Science and Utility Theory were waged against a feckless and discombobulated anti-war movement who would repeat the sound bites of 'popular uprising' and the 'defeat of US imperialism in the Middle East' implanted in their minds by one of the most impressive and successful US/Israeli geostrategic operations in modern history.

On the eve of NATO's bombing of Libya, the BBC predictably called upon an old reliable 'critic of US foreign-policy' Noam Chomsky. The veteran American philosopher agreed that the West had a "duty" to "stop the massacres" in Libya thus ensuring there would be no moral outrage among the so-called "anti-war movement" to a NATO military intervention. The invitation of Noam Chomsky by the Zionist-controlled BBC illustrates the importance for British intelligence of ideologically disarming potential 'leftist' opponents in the run-up to meticulously

planned wars of aggression, disguised as 'humanitarian interventions'.

Chomsky stated that 'there may come a time when it would make sense for the West to become involved… but the question is has that time come.' No anti-imperialist would ever suggest that it could make sense for the West to intervene militarily in another country, under any circumstances.

Given Chomsky's anarchist ideology — the very ideology instrumentalised by the CIA in colour revolutions — the BBC knew he would go along with their fake 'popular uprising' in Benghazi; thus providing justification to wage 'humanitarian' warfare in support of the 'revolution'.

In 2013, a massive military destablisation of Brazil was undertaken by US NGOs, operating under the guidance of the CIA, in order to weaken the popularity of a government moving far too close to Russia and China in the eyes of Washington. Again, the CIA's 'Vinegar Revolution' received full support from most 'leftist' quarters. Once again, military geostrategy had triumphed over anti-imperialist analysis.

The current refugee crisis proves that US/Israeli military geostrategy is running circles around its opponents who, instead of identifying the culprits who are using human beings as weapons, are unwittingly collaborating with Zionism's plan to inundate Europe with migrants for the purposes of fomenting civil war in the European peninsula. It is a desperate effort to prevent Eurasian integration, a prospect inimical to what the Pentagon refers to as 'full spectrum dominance'.

Those who have joined in the chorus of welcoming the refugees/migrants are unwitting participants in an extension of Zionism's neo-colonial wars in Africa and the Middle East. They are also complicit in the endorsement and cover-up of a modern slave trade. Opposing imperialism requires study of the logic of its geostrategic operations.

Imperialism's deliberate flooding of Europe with a Wahhabised lumpen-proletariat from a war-torn Southern Hemisphere will not help the cause of labour, the cause of human freedom. Rather, it will contribute to preventing the unification of the European-peninsula with the Eurasian Heartland. It will also contribute towards the further colonisation and destruction of independent African and Middle Eastern nations such as Eritrea and Syria.

An example of Marxist Leninist parties' inability to deal with imperialism's weaponization of migrants comes from the Communist Party of Great Britain (Marxist Leninist). Their argument in favour of immigration is sound under normal circumstances but they fail to address the problem of when immigration becomes a tool of imperialism, a specific geopolitical strategy aimed at destabilizing both the country of origin and the destination of the migrant.

The recent resolution of the CPGBML is worth reproducing here in full:

> This party firmly believes that immigration is not the cause of the ills of the working class in Britain, which are solely the result of the failings of the capitalist system.
>
> Immigration and asylum legislation and controls under capitalism have only one real goal: the division of the working class along racial lines, thus fatally weakening that class's ability to organise itself and to wage a revolutionary struggle for the overthrow of imperialism.
>
> These controls have the further effect of creating an army of 'illegal' immigrant workers, prey to super exploitation and living in dire conditions as an underclass, outside the system, afraid to organise and exercising a downward pull on the wages and conditions of all workers.
>
> The scourge of racism, along with all other ills of capitalism, will only

> be finally abolished after the successful overthrow of imperialism. But since immigration can no more be abolished under capitalism than can wage slavery, our call should not be for the further control and scapegoating of immigrants, but the abolition of all border controls, as part of the wider fight to uproot racism from the working-class movement and build unity among workers in Britain, so strengthening the fight for communism.

The problem here is that no distinction is made between immigration into imperialist countries and immigration into semi-colonial type countries. For example, Syria has been forced to close its borders due to the passage of terrorists in the service of imperialism. In such circumstances, it would be ludicrous to condemn the Syrian government for erecting fences to protect its borders. Similarly, Hungary, a small country which has just taken modest steps towards escaping from the clutches of US imperialism under the control of the IMF, has decided to erect fences to protect its borders from what it perceives as an attempt by US imperialism to destablize the country. Under these conditions, such a decision is entirely justified. The CPGBML argues correctly that "the scourge of racism, along with all other ills of capitalism, will only be finally abolished after the successful overthrow of imperialism." The erection of fences in Hungary is part of that fight against imperialism, when migrants are clearly being used as weapons of imperialist strategy against recalcitrant nation-states.

The fact that Zionism is using the refugee crisis to further its imperialist agenda does not mean, however, that all refugees in the world are being used for this purpose. Rather, just as in the Arab Spring where the social inequalities of capitalism were used by imperialism to further the cause of capitalism, many refugees coming from the Middle East and Africa are being used for the same purpose.

Throughout the world *Homo sapiens* is being supplanted by *Homo*

economicus: a vacuous, brain-washed, rootless cosmopolitan, a deterritorialised and acculturated nomad, hopelessly blown hither and thither by the exigencies of capital. Meanwhile, Zionism continues to stoke up the incessant and utterly fraudulent War on Terror, with omnipresent mass surveillance of the "nations" (goyim) while at the same time Jews are being encouraged by the Israeli regime to leave Europe for settlement on Arab lands, ruined and depopulated by Zionism's wars.

The 'refugee crisis' is indubitably one more step towards the creation of a Greater Israel. Benjamin Netanyahu recently told the I*sraeli National News* that Israel must become a "world power".

To politically correct pundits, Victor Orban's fence might appear inhumane and xenophobic, but at this moment in history the concrete choice presented to us is between temporary fences designed to protect nations from imperialism or Zionist walls built to imprison humanity.

• Read Part One, Part Two, Part Three, Part Four, Part Five, Part Six, Part Seven, Part Eight, Part Nine, Part Ten

Gearóid Ó Colmáin is a journalist and political analyst based in Paris. His work focuses on globalization, geopolitics and class struggle. He is a regular contributor to Dissident Voice, Global Research, Russia Today International, Press TV, Sputnik Radio France, Sputnik English, Al Etijah TV, Sahar TV, and has also appeared on Al Jazeera and Al Mayadeen. He writes in English, Gaelic, and French. Read other articles by Gearóid, or visit Gearóid's website.

This article was posted on Monday, April 11th, 2016 at 10:00pm and is filed under Africa, Brazil, Capitalism, China, CIA, Communism/Marxism/Maoism, Economy/Economics, Empire, Eritrea, Espionage/"Intelligence", EU, Europe, Germany, Hungary, Imperialism, Israel/Palestine, Media, Mercenaries, Militarism, Neoliberalism, NGOs, Propaganda, Qatar, Refugees, Syria, Terrorism (state and retail), Tunisia, Turkey, Zionism.